Is the Ivory Tower wheelchair accessible?

What are the barriers and enablers to the employment of disabled academics and what theoretical frameworks can be adopted to understand them?

Nadia Ahmed

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the

University of London for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Queen Mary University of London

2020

Declaration of Authorship

I, Nadia Ahmed, confirm that the research included within this thesis is my own work or that where it has been carried out in collaboration with, or supported by others, that this is duly acknowledged below and my contribution indicated. Previously published material is also acknowledged below.

I attest that I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the work is original and does not to the best of my knowledge break any UK law, infringe any third party's copyright or other Intellectual Property Right, or contain any confidential material.

I accept that the College has the right to use plagiarism detection software to check the electronic version of the thesis.

I confirm that this thesis has not been previously submitted for the award of a degree by this or any other university.

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author.

Signature:_____ Date: February 2020

Abstract

Through this research, the author has sought to emancipate and raise the voices of disabled academics. The marginalisation of disabled people in employment, education and everyday life is still a reality and the situations are no different in academia. Indeed, as the title of this thesis suggests, even the traditional metaphor for academia, the ivory tower, seems disability unfriendly. Nonetheless, disabled people are not passive or inactive, in fact disabled workers and academics are actively challenging this understanding and working towards bringing a change.

To understand the disabling effects and ableism in society the concepts and models of disability play a crucial role and are incorporated in this thesis. However, the social model has certain limitations suggesting that disability is not an individual deficit. Instead, it is a collective experience of oppression, resulting in the exclusion of disabled people and social invalidation of their personal disability experiences. In order to understand these gaps created by the social model, the political theories of Antonio Gramsci are used to analyse disabled academics' university workplace employment and their activism.

This research topic is dear to the author because she is a disabled PhD student, struggling to achieve employment as an academic. The factors influencing the transition from disabled academic student to a disabled professional academic becomes problematic due to many political, social and physical aspects, which are elaborated in the auto-ethnography in Chapter Seven of this thesis. It is suggested that disabled students' lives are now mostly accessible; however, becoming an academic and getting academic employment remains difficult. The findings reported in the thesis draw upon ten in-depth oral histories with disabled academics, triangulated with seven semi-structured interviews with Human Resource (HR) managers and extensive documentary analysis of the policies and practices at three University case-studies. Drawing on a Gramscian theoretical framework, the research findings demonstrate a strong influence of traditional and/or organic contemporary understanding of disability and HR practices in three University case-studies, which, in turn, influence the employment experiences of disabled academics. The differences that are identified among the three University case-studies highlight how disabled hegemonies influence different perceptions and assumptions about disability and ableism, but also that they are not universal or inevitable.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to those who supported me through the journey of writing this thesis.

First and foremost, I offer my sincerest appreciation to my wonderful supervisors Professor Hazel Conley and Professor Mike Noon, for their guidance, patience, advice and all their time during the last seven years. My supervisors have always been supportive, encouraging and caring through the ups and down of my PhD journey. I could not have imagined having better supervisors.

I would also like to thank my friends Dr Barbara Samaluk, Dr Maryam Aldossari, Maria Fernanda Quintero, Dr Eranjan Udayanga Padumadasa Dr Ramin Nassehi, Dr Emily Yarrow, Dr Rashne Limki, Dr (Clify) Clifford Lewis, Dr Lisa Diane Morrison, Dr Gulce Ipek, Dr Samuel Asante-Nnuro, Dr Tessa Wright, Dr Ahu Tati, Dr Cathrine Seierstad, Dr Dennis De Widt, Dr Jorge Louzada, Dr Marrisa Dominique Joseph, Dr Zunira Irfan and colleagues at SBM Professor Maxine Robertson, Professor Geraldine Healy, Professor Brigitte Granville, Professor Gill Kirton, Dr Yasmin Ibrahim, Professor Stefan Krummaker, Professor Perri 6, Dr Owolabi Bakre, Dr Sadhvi Dar, Dr Andromachi Athanasopoulou, Dr Doyin Atewologun, Dr Elena Doldor, Dr Ishani Chandrasekara, Dr Maria Koumenta, Dr Sanghamitra Bandyopadhyay, Professor Stephen Fox, Professor Nicholas O'Shaughnessy, Chandres Tejura, Saima Ahmed, Monira Begum, Jenny, James, Emm, Steve, Ciara, Saritha, Anisha, Aktar, Sheraz, Simon Jarvis and the entire School of Business Management and the Disability and Dyslexia Services at Queen Mary University of London. As I walked the path towards completing my doctoral research. I could not have done it without your support and encouragement.

I have been lucky to have had such wonderful and supportive friends and colleagues; who have been like family to me far away from home. To Abida, Salma, Aunty Ayan, Ash, Muhammed Kasbar, Emily Danielle Pfefer, Zee Zee, Ann, Zainebu, Chidozie, everybody I would like to thank for always being and giving helpful advice, cheerful conversations, and supportiveness.

To my, mother Mama Fauzia Ahmad, all my three sisters Tania, Anum and Amna and young Zara my niece, for their encouragement and support along the way. Thank you.

Last but not the least, I can’t express my gratitude enough for my father Professor Mansoor Ahmad Papa, for his endless encouragement and support. Without you, I would not be the person I am today. I hope I have made you proud.

Contents

1.0 Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

'Nothing about Us, without Us' (Charlton, 1998: 3), disabled people are perceived as objects of scorn or pity, to be cured or managed, problem confronted or ignored, leading to decisions without their input. Therefore, raising voices in frustration within a society challenges assumptions that disabled people have no voice at all (Pelka, 2012).

Most of what is known is the reproduction of what is already researched. However, reasoning, thinking differently and recasting problems gives rise to new and innovative ideas (Pennycook and Barr, 2018). In this thesis, the author is attempting to investigate new ways to respond to the political necessity of pursuing forms of inquiry into disability that are different from producing more of similar research answers (Titchkosky, 2011). Use of the term 'wheelchair' in the title: Is the Ivory Tower wheelchair accessible, is a metaphor towards the internationally recognised blue wheelchair symbol, suggesting multiple disabilities.

The purpose of this chapter is to set out the intellectual, substantive context and rationale of the research conducted to answer the research question below and its role in advancing the discipline:

> *What are the barriers and enablers to the employment of disabled academics and what theoretical frameworks can be adopted to understand them?*

One of the main contributions of the thesis, elaborated in Chapter Four, is the development of a Gramscian theoretical framework for the analysis of disability in the academic workplace. Drawing on this framework, the following sub-questions were also taken into account:

1. Why and how does the history of attitudes towards disability influence employment of disabled academics?
2. How is disability hegemonized within equality policies and practices in academia?
3. Is emancipatory research part of being an organic-intellectual?
4. How do the models of disability influence the policies and practises of universities for disabled academics' employment?
5. Are disabled academics organic-intellectuals? If so, how is this manifested?
6. How do some parts of the legislation, create the medical model as hegemony, whereas, other parts encourage disabled organic-intellectuals to challenge the hegemony?

1.2 Rationale for the Research

This thesis investigates the management and organisation of the academic workplace as it is experienced by disabled academics. Despite the upsurge in the disability equality legislation, society has not moved beyond the physical barriers to access to achieve any transformative alterations in behaviour or attitude (Martinez, 2012). As identified below, labour market participation remains one of the most tenacious barriers for disabled people. To effectively provide job opportunities, employers should recognise the abilities of disabled people. The author aims to identify how, despite being highly educated and trained, disabled academics encounter obstructions in employment because they are underestimated.

New research shows that despite progress, a disability equality gap remains (EHRC, 2017b). These findings should initiate further debate on disability equality at Universities regarding practice and theory. The analysis and findings presented in this thesis will aid in this project by providing empirical evidence and an innovative reconceptualization of the theoretical debates on models of disability. Above all, it is intended that the research reinforces disability equality, not just as abstract impractical ideas (Orlans, 1972), but as essentially emancipatory. Additionally, it is hoped that the findings will feed into other projects, therefore, providing information for future research.

Although, the focus of this PhD thesis is not a legal analysis of the current disability legislation within the Equality Act 2010 (EqA), the following sections provide an overview of the disability legislation in England with a particular focus on its application to employment.

1.3 Background of the Disability Legislations

Historically, legislation on disability was used merely as a means to identify the difference between disabled and non-disabled people. This identification succeeded in segregating and excluding disabled people from social and political practises, like education and employment. For example, children with disabilities were excluded from attending state schools (RSBC, 2013). In 1944 the Disabled Persons Employment Act was introduced proposing that within a workforce of 20 persons, 3% of employees should be registered disabled. However, this legislation was implemented and pursued in a languorous manner, which caused less effort towards penalising employers who failed to satisfy the recruitment and employment target of disabled people (Barnes and Mercer, 2004a). Therefore, it can be said that this legislation was generally ignored by employers also the government took no action to enforce it (Doyle, 1994). In 1995 the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) introduced the concept of reasonable adjustments, which developed due to the campaigning of disabled people, before it was incorporated into the Equality Act (EqA). Aiming to reduce discrimination, making buildings accessible, providing documents in Braille and generally accommodating the disabled person's needs. Importantly, not obeying or violating this legislation

had legal consequences (EHRC, 2015). The consequences may include fines, injunctions causing damage to the company's reputation or negative credit rating and even possible loss of contracts (HC, 2019). For example, in 2012, in Yorkshire involving the NHS, a fine of £4.5 million had to be paid by the employer to the victimised employee (Shah, 2012).

1.4 Overview of the EqA containing the legislative framework on disability

Current disability discrimination legislation is contained in the EqA, part of which removes disabling barriers for underprivileged groups and focuses on altering the social environment for disabled people. It is the outcome of fourteen years of campaigning for equality and human rights (Hepple, 2010). On the 1st of October 2010 the EqA came into force, combining and replacing previous anti-discrimination law.

The EqA in section 6(1) defines disability as a person having a physical or mental impairment, which has a 'substantial' and 'long-term' disabling effect on the normal day-to-day life. Here the term 'substantial' suggests that the impairment is more than minor or trivial, e.g. it takes much longer than it usually would to complete a daily task like getting dressed. Also, using the term 'long-term' suggests an approximate long-time lapse, like 12 months or more, e.g. a breathing condition that develops as a result of a lung infection.

This above definition also includes progressive, recurring or fluctuating conditions, e.g. arthritis, Multiple Sclerosis or Friedreich's Ataxia. Additionally, diagnosis of illness, like HIV infection or cancer, automatically meets the disability definition under the EqA. However, conditions like addiction to non-prescribed drugs or alcohol is not counted as a disability (EqA, 2010).

The EqA was developed in order to strengthen protection against discrimination (Barnes, 2013b), providing rights and extending equality to a wider range of protected characteristics (ECU, 2011a). Furthermore, the EqA also enhances and strengthens disability protection (Lockwood et al., 2012). For example, in section 15 of the EqA, disability discrimination is considered when a disabled employee is treated unfavourably (Bristol., 2011). Similarly, in Section 20 and 21 of the EqA imposes the implementation of reasonable adjustments for the disabled applicants and/or employees, i.e. disabled employees disadvantaged by workplace and/or its practices, reasonable adjustments/steps must be provided by the employer/manager (EHRC, 2010b, Gov.UK, 2011, ECU, 2011b).

This implements the most important part of the law against disability discrimination, which is the duty on employers to make reasonable adjustments. Essentially suggesting three requirements in Section 21 which are as follows. In Section 20(3) is the first requirement, that a provision, criterion or practice of A's puts a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage in relation to a relevant matter in comparison with persons who are not disabled, to take such steps as it is reasonable to have to take

in order to avoid the disadvantage. The second requirement is in Section 20(4) mentions that, where a physical feature puts a disabled person at a substantial disadvantage in relation to a relevant matter in comparison with persons who are not disabled, to take such steps as it is reasonable to have to take in order to avoid the disadvantage. Furthermore, under Section 20(9), this also includes removing the physical feature, altering it or providing a reasonable means of avoiding it. Lastly, the third requirement in Section 20(5) suggests a requirement, where a disabled person would be provided an auxiliary (secondary-supporting) aid, which is a substantial disadvantage in relation to a relevant matter in comparison with persons who are not disabled, taking such steps is provision towards such auxiliary aids is fulfilling the compliance of reasonable adjustments. For example, adjusting hours or duties, buying or modifying equipment or allowing time off, so that the disabled employees can carry out their job. Simultaneously, Section 20(7), suggests that employers are not allowed to ask the disabled employee to pay for the costs towards the provided reasonable adjustment. However, if the employer/manager of the workplace fails to comply with any of the requirements regarding reasonable adjustments, according to Section 21 the employer is charged with legal consequences, mentioned above in section 1.3 Background of the Disability Legislations i.e. page 14 of this thesis (Lewis, 2012).

Therefore, the legislation provides a framework for implementation of reasonable adjustments, accessible policies and practices that do not discriminate against existing or prospective disabled employees.

1.5 The EqA and the Employment of Disabled People

The EqA purports to protect disabled people from discrimination in employment and promote their civil rights. These are Indirect Discrimination in section 19, Discrimination arising from Disability in section 15, disallowing employers to ask about job applicants' health in section 60, protection where discrimination or harassment arises from a wrong perception that a person is disabled, or where it is based on a person's association with a disabled person and in section 124 provides employment tribunals with an opportunity to recommend measures to improve organisational practice, beyond those afforded to the claimant (EqA, 2010).

It is the duty of the employer to make reasonable adjustments in the workplace to avoid disabled employees being put at a disadvantage compared to non-disabled people in the workplace, required by section 20(2) of the EqA. For example, the employer is legally obligated to adjust or create flexibility of working hours or provision of special equipment to help disabled employees do the job.

At the time of recruitment, the employer can only ask the disabled person the following concerning health or disability questions:

- If they can carry out a task that is an essential part of the work.
- If they can take part in an interview.
- If the interviewers need to make reasonable adjustments for the disabled person in the selection process.
- For the purpose of monitoring for equal opportunities and to increase the number of disabled people employed at a workplace.
- For the purposes of national security checks.

Additionally, disabled employees cannot be unfairly chosen for redundancy and retirement. The selection process for redundancy must be fair and balanced for all employees. The employer cannot force employees to retire if they become disabled.

1.6 The EqA from disabled person's Perspective and its Limitations

Although, it is twenty-five years since the DDA and nine years since the EqA came into force to promote an improvement on the position of disabled peoples', discrimination in employment still exists. For example, in 2019, 51.7% of disabled people were in employment, compared to 81.7% of non-disabled people (Powell, 2019).

This inability to tackle discrimination appropriately has occurred because of three specific limitations. First, the restrictive statutory definition of disability (Geffen, 2013). When investigating the statutory definition of disability within the EqA, it seems to challenge the exclusion of large numbers of disabled people having various impairments. The definition suggests that a disabled person may not qualify as disabled in the legislation, because to qualify for protection it is not sufficient that the person is discriminated against or not, but whether they are disabled enough to be afforded such protection. So, for those whose disability is unlikely to be long term enough, or its effects are not substantial enough, there is no protection. Unfortunately, this rationale cannot be applied to disabled people, because normal day-to-day activities for the majority of the population are often a struggle for disabled people. For example, a person with mental illness disability, the most discriminated of disabilities, is often unlikely to meet the definition because of the unpredictable nature of her/his disability, (Boardman et al., 2003).

Secondly, the reactive nature of the duty on employers to make reasonable adjustments. This means that the employer needs to be informed that the employee is disabled, meaning that he/she is at a substantial disadvantage compared to a nondisabled employee, and then the employer needs to only take reasonable steps to avoid the disadvantage (Lawson, 2008). For example, instead of providing step-free access to wheelchair users beforehand, this will only be taken into account after this issue was flagged by the disabled employee. Suggesting that the adjustment focuses on the employee's disability, rather than on the disabling work environment. Thus, the employer is only

required to react to an individual situation and do the minimum to avoid the barrier, not necessarily remove it. Such experiences were recorded during the empirical research of this thesis, mentioned in Chapter Ten, Eleven and Twelve, also in the author's auto-ethnography Chapter Nine. Therefore, it would be better to have an inclusive rather than excluding definition of disability and to convert the reactive duty into a proactive approach. This would transform the EqA into an enabling legislation, giving greater protection to and help integrate a larger number of disabled people into employment.

Thirdly, a profound issue related towards implementing inappropriate reasonable adjustments is the lack of proper knowledge of the EqA by the employers and line-managers highlighted by Foster (2007). Although 'Access to Work', a Government programme to support the disabled, support for the costs of reasonable adjustments exists, it is weakened due to a lack of awareness of legislation by the employers' and line-managers whose behaviour is prioritised and primarily shaped by economic concerns. Thus, this leads to their being resistant to the concept of treating disabled employees differently from non-disabled employees. For example, employers and line-managers may be reluctant to seek specialist HR or medical advice, demonstrating inconsistent or ill-considered responses, perceived as unsympathetic to disabled employees (Fevre et al., 2013). In addition, the concept of 'reasonable' applied to reasonable adjustments in the legislation means that employers and line-managers do not have to really make adjustments if they do not consider that they are reasonable and they will only do the minimal possible adjustments. Therefore, the concept as intended in the legislation is not considered for providing disabled workers with adjustments to remove disabling barriers in the workplace, instead ensuring it does not interfere with financial profit of the workplace (Foster and Scott, 2015).

These weaknesses of the EqA are based on the individual medicalised model of disability, which is elaborated discussed in Chapters Two and Four.

1.7 Comparing disabled and non-disabled peoples Employment and Unemployment

It is argued that an impairment or ill health causing a disability, affects employment status more than gender (Westcott, 2008) or other equality strands. Disabled employees are paid less, in both full-time and part-time work and earn on average 25% less than their non-disabled counterparts (Burchardt, 2000); this is also, referred to as the 'disability employment gap' which is the difference in the employment rate of disabled people and non-disabled people. In 2019 the employment rate is 52.6%, compared to an employment rate is 81.5%, meaning that the gap was 28.9 percentage points (ONS, 2019).

Table 1.1 Yearly employment status of disabled and non-disabled people. Source: Office for National Statistics: (ONS, 2019)

Yearly Employment	% Disabled People in employment	% Non-Disabled People in employment	% Employment Gap
2019	52.6	81.5	28.9
2018	51.5	81.7	30.2
2017	50.5	81.1	30.6
2016	49.5	80.3	30.8
2015	46.6	80.3	33.7
2014	45.5	79.2	33.7

1.8 Employment status among Disabled People

The employment of disabled people depends considerably on their disability/impairments (Powell, 2019). Some disabled people are ready and willing to work, if they were not constrained by their disability/impairments (Ali et al., 2011) whereas, at times the workplace may also exclude people due to their disability (Bonaccio et al., 2019). For this purpose, 52.6% disabled people are in employment, compared to 7.3% of unemployed disabled people, and 43.3% of disabled people are classified as economically inactive, i.e. not seeking work (ONS, 2019).

Table 1.2 Yearly Employment, Unemployment and Economically inactive statistics among Disabled People. Source: Office for National Statistics: (ONS, 2019)

Yearly Employment	% Employment of Disabled People	% Unemployment of Disabled People	% Economically inactive Disabled People
2019	52.6	7.3	43.3
2018	51.5	8.5	43.7
2017	50.5	9.1	44.4
2016	49.5	9.2	45.4
2015	46.6	10.5	47.9
2014	45.5	11.3	48.6

1.9 Locating Disabled Academics in universities

Disabled people are disproportionately represented in low status and manual work and are underrepresented in management and professional employment (Barnes and Mercer, 2005). Fevre et al. (2016) and Williams and Mavin (2015) argue there is a lack of study about disability and disabled employees, particularly those in professional roles such as academic work. Where research has been conducted, the findings are that disabled academics are marginalized in university employment and other academic roles (Williams and Mavin, 2012).

Table 1.3 Yearly employment of Academics. Source: Higher Education Statistical Agency: (HESA, 2019)

Academic year	**Total academics in universities**	**Number of disabled academics**	**Percentage of disabled academics**
2017/18	211980	8795	4.1%
2016/17	206870	8195	4.0%
2015/16	201380	7825	3.9%
2014/15	198335	7725	3.9%
2013/14	194245	7185	3.7%
2012/13	185585	6220	3.5%
2011/12	181385	5250	3.2%
2010/11	181185	4800	2.9%
2009/10	181595	4565	2.8%

According to the Labour Force Survey approximately 17.8% of the national population of working age are disabled (ONS, 2018). In an ideal world we might, therefore, reasonably expect organisations to be aiming for 17% of their workforce to have a disability.

Any organisation having below 17.8% of disabled employees is below the national average (Powell, 2019). Academia, with only 4.1%, is well below this figure, although there is some improvement from 2009/10, but it is very slow paced.

Clearly, slow legislative progressive attempts are being made in improving disability rights at work. However, issues of disability discrimination cannot be challenged just through government legislation; in fact, the effort of the entire workplace is required to protect the employment rights of

disabled employees (Thornton and Lunt, 1995, Brading and Curtis, 1996, Foster and Scott, 2015). For this purpose, it is necessary to study the management and organisation of the workplace and its role in constructing and maintaining social classifications and peoples' experiences (Prichard and Benschop, 2018). The focus of this PhD thesis is on the employment of disabled academics and the management and organisation of their workplace.

1.10 Thesis Outline

The broad aim of this thesis is to examine the experiences of disabled academics that underpin the statistics above. It does so by providing an analysis of the practices, policies, attitudinal and physical barriers to access with the objective of leading to improved practices in universities. Simultaneously, experiences of disabled academics and their journey towards becoming an academic will be studied, because, although great strides have been made in relation to access for disabled students, getting employment as a fully trained academic in a university seems inaccessible (Jacobs, 2010). This PhD thesis comprises of twelve chapters, the content of which is summarised below:

Chapter One this chapter presents the rationale of the research and an outline of this thesis. Furthermore, an analysis of the previous and current legislation on disability and employment is provided and applied to the employment of disabled people in the country and then disabled academics, which is the focus of this thesis.

Chapter Two reviews the disability literature about the historical and contemporary understanding and perceptions of disability in society. Academically, these discussions were directed towards the formation of the two main disability models, which assisted in framing and understanding the workplace experiences of disabled academics. This chapter assists in contributing towards answering one of the research questions: 'Why and how does the history of attitudes towards disability influence employment of disabled academics?'

Chapter Three gives an overview of the literature on disabled employees and the purpose of equality, diversity and inclusion management that claims a business case for developing a wider pool of employees, including disabled employees, by providing better strategic practises and policies to position the workplace competitively in the marketplace. Although, disability has much been neglected within HR management, this chapter critically explores the business case for employing and retaining disabled people at the workplace before specifically considering the academic workplace.

The chapter turns to focus on employment of disabled academics, mentioning the in-accessibilities and the practical, ethical, social and conceptual barriers they specifically encounter, such as those created by funding bodies. The chapter, therefore, provides important contextual data on the higher

education sector, providing a reference point from which to investigate the experiences and recommendations given by the disabled academic participants of the three University case-studies.

Chapter Four outlines the theoretical and conceptual framework of this research thesis, which includes a critical analysis of theories, concepts and the models of disability, liberal and radical approaches to equality and proposes an innovative use of Gramsci's theories. Using such a framework enables the exploration of complex, social/anti-social, relational and personal/impersonal situations of disabled employees at the workplace. The framework offers an alternative approach to identify the development of ideologies that build dominant social hegemony towards disability. Similarly, the disability models assist in revealing how the policies and practises implemented at the workplace are shaped by the liberal and radical approaches to equality and the corresponding effects on disabled employees. Furthermore, the framework uses the historical positioning of disability to examine the current situation of exclusion or inclusion of disabled academic employees at the workplace. Finally, the framework is used to develop research questions to guide the empirical contribution of this thesis.

Chapter Five reviews the developing historical trends of disability research within social sciences in order to build an understanding of the importance of research on disability and to contextualise the methodological approach adopted in this thesis. The focus is on disability research praxis, which queries knowledge production as part of the epistemology within disability research. Debates on the importance of the disabled researcher, as well as the disabled research participants are considered, also the contribution of feminist theory to an emancipatory research approach. Lastly, the chapter considers the position of the author as reflexive and self-critical, embodying a new and challenging approach towards doing disability research as more than simply a technical procedure.

Following on from the previous chapter, *Chapter Six* locates the epistemological and ontological orientation and outlines a rationale for the methodological choices shaping this thesis. The research process is outlined, highlighting the methods adopted to collect and then interpret the documentary data, HR participants' semi-structured interviews and the disabled academics' OH narrative accounts at the three University case-studies.

Chapter Seven introduces the first empirical contribution of the thesis by using auto-ethnography to highlight the barriers experienced by the author during the research process. For this purpose, the author began to acquaint herself with the detailed social reality of becoming a disabled academic, encountering obstacles while conducting research in an ableist physical and cultural environment, before exploring the experiences of other academics. She feels that using an auto-ethnographic

writing style is a socially just way of doing disability research, therefore, helping to fill the void in which disabled academics are rendered invisible.

Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten contain the analysis of the three case-study universities. Each of the case-study chapters follow the same format, structured around common themes that emerged from the data analysis. Firstly, the organisational structure and policies are analysed, particularly regarding the treatment of disabled employees. Next, work-history descriptions of the disabled academic participants are provided. Lastly, a large portion of each chapter involves describing the interviews i.e. semi-structured interviews with HR managers and OH dialogues with disabled academic employees in order to capture experiences, explore different realities and cross-analysing and comparing the policies and interview narratives.

(Chapter Eight contains the data analysis of the first of three case study chapters. It provides an in-depth analysis of the first case study University, given the pseudonym 1UCS. Chapter Nine analyses data from the second case-study University given the pseudonym 2UCS. Chapter Ten contains the data analysis of the third and final case-study, 3UCS).

Chapter Eleven presents a focused discussion of the thesis, bringing together the theoretical and conceptual framework and the empirical data analysis from the auto-ethnography and the three University case-study analysis chapters. It takes forward the interpretations of the analysis of disabled academic's employment barriers, in order to offer a conceptualization that is shaped through the disabled academics' employment experiences. The analysis is synthesizing, through the social and individualised medical models of disability, the Gramscian theoretical framework and some of the extant literature explored in Chapters Two, Three and Five. The chapter contributes to understanding how disability and ableism are hegemonized and shape disabled academics' employment experiences and whether their status as academic employees has been accepted or denied.

Chapter Twelve reflects back upon the research objectives through which the thesis aims to answer the overarching research question and the sub-questions that helped in the development and construction of this thesis, making an original contribution towards understanding disability and disabled academics' employment. Lastly, the limitations of the thesis are considered, concluding by identifying possible further research projects.

2.0 Chapter Two: Society and disabled people

2.1 Introduction

To identify and analyse the disability barriers faced by disabled academics, the background of disability needs to be investigated, because 'if you want to understand today, you have to search yesterday' (Singh, 2006: 275). For this purpose, this Chapter includes a concise overview of the historical perspective and the current context of disability in relation to society and academic employment. This is achieved by investigating social experiences of disabled academics, which assisted in re-developing and re-conceptualising disability, through discovering their perspective towards equality, diversity and inclusion (EDI). Using such an approach contributes towards the understanding of this thesis. Although, this Chapter focuses just on presenting a brief summary of disabled peoples' historical timeline within the disability literature, it is also relevant in answering the main research question:

> *What are the barriers and enablers to the employment of disabled academics and what theoretical frameworks can be adopted to understand them?*

This Chapter also assists in addressing the societal circumstances and disability effects of influencing disabled people's employment.

2.2 Are we everywhere?

> 'We are everywhere these days, wheeling and loping down the street, tapping our canes, sucking on breathing-tubes, following our guide dogs, fidgeting with joysticks that propel our motorised-wheelchairs. We may drool, hear-voices, speak in staccato-syllables, and wear catheters to collect our urine, or live with a compromised-immune-system. We are bound-together, not by this list of our collective-symptoms, but by the social and political-circumstances that have forged us a group' (Linton, 1998: 3).

This is an acknowledgement and reminder that disabled people are everywhere in society unwilling to recognise invisibility as disabled-beings (Oliver and Barnes, 2010), for example, at the workplace when employers indicate reluctance towards accepting disabled people. The legislation, policies and practices prescribed for disability equality are slow to be implemented and equally sluggish to see disability as an important new site for analysis (Heyer, 2007, Oliver and Barnes, 2010, Geffen, 2013). Traditionally, disability was seen as a spoiled identity, something to be fixed rather than a social and political category, powerfully shaping identity through disabled people's experiences (Gray, 2009, Campbell and Oliver, 2013). They were considered as objects, subjected to the fields of medical rehabilitation, special-education and counselling (Barnes, 2014a).

Even now disabled people's discrimination is much identified in society (EHRC, 2017a). For example, the Guardian published a recent article discussing issues of disability discrimination in the UK. Approximately 47% of disabled people have experienced negative attitudes towards disability, which is worsening with time (Marsh, 2011). Also, an Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC, 2011a) report concluded that, 'disabled people in the UK face harassment, insult and attack almost as a matter of routine, while denial among police, government and other public bodies means little is done to challenge the situation' (Marsh, 2011: website). Additionally, recent political and economic situations between Great Britain and Europe do not sound very supportive towards disability. For example, Montero (2017) in an article named 'What does Brexit mean for people with disabilities?' outlines how the rights and grants funding of disabled people are under threat due to fluctuating changes in economy and legislation, adding to the unwillingness to recognise acceptance of disabled people.

2.3 Disability; what IS the fuss all about?

It is suggested that, 'everyone is impaired, in varying degrees' (Shakespeare and Watson, 2001: 24). This offers an understanding of human experience and a springboard for dismantling social constructs of being 'disabled' and 'normal' (Thomas, 2004b: 541). Although, much before considering disability as a social construct, disability misconception was that disabled people are cripples, freaks, blind, deaf and dumb, represented in unfortunate ways as unholy monsters (Barnes, 1985, Oliver, 1990b, Barnes, 1991, Borsay, 2003, Barnes, 2004). There has always been a distinct pattern of oppression, discrimination and stigma of bodily-differences (Turner, 2008, Grue, 2011, Lamond, 2017), which will be expanded below.

Since, the 1960s societies are continuously being reminded by activists, academics and government-legislation that disabled people should be accepted as a norm (Barnes, 2004, Sheldon, 2005). In the UK, equality agencies like the Equality Human Rights Commission (EHRC), Equality Challenge Unit (ECU), the Trades Union Congress (TUC) supported by previous and present legislations, i.e. the Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (DDA) and the Equality Act 2010 (EqA), are clearly against ableism. The objective is to improve inclusion by supporting equality and eradicating discrimination within society (Hepple et al., 1997, Hepple, 2010, Fredman, 2011). Although legislation and policies within society provide protection against disability discrimination, the debate is that the variation towards being 'ideal' or having an imperfect body, having a disability or people belonging/having different colour, creed or race, creating inequalities, suggests that life outside this norm is characterized by isolation, muteness and abuse (Clapton and Fitzgerald, 2011, Foster and Wass, 2013). There has always been a consistent bias toward disabled people who, even now, are 'patronized, blessed, left to die of exposure, institutionalized, cured or rehabilitated' (Grue, 2011: 535, Thomson, 2017).

However, now they are forging into the world with a sense of collective consciousness, a sense of togetherness that is not generated by their physical ails, but by the way society responds to their disabilities (Oliver, 1990a, Gordon and Reynolds, 2017).

In order to appreciate the extent and complexity of disability discrimination in society, it is necessary to understand the historical background of disabled people's social experiences (Dilthey, 2012). According to Barnes (2014a), disability discrimination is associated with the history of economic and political practises and policies, placing disabled people in a marginalised and oppressive role. The objective of the section below is to pull together the political and cultural foundations of disability discrimination. This is done by analysing the historical discriminatory practices and policies, demonstrating their influence on current societal and institutional attitudes and practises.

2.4 Historical Background of Disability

Since, the beginning of time societies have been intolerant towards disabled people, treating them equally harsh (Albrecht, 1992, Garland, 1995). For example, during the thirteenth century disabled people were often made scapegoats as sinners or evil upon society. In the fifteenth century the founder of Protestantism Martin Luther, stated that disabled people need to be unforgivingly put to death, because disability is due to black-magic and evil forces (Haffter, 1968). Apart from cultural prejudice and bias, economic fluctuations have also had an impact on disabled people's discrimination.

Economic inconsistency plays a major role towards disabled people's intolerance, because as Barnes (1991: 11) explains, 'our distant-ancestors lived in such a harsh environment that there was little opportunity to support (disabled people) who could not take care of themselves' (Thomas, 1982). In the sixteenth-century, disabled people rejected by their families and without any financial resources earned a living by displaying themselves at fairs. Thus, providing the public a source of amusement and entertainment (Nicholli, 1990). However, when the economy became strong and steady, disabled people were supported through charity, giving rise to the development of the Poor Law, the first official legislation for disabled people's intervention (Stone, 1986), although this law created further discrimination among the 'deserving poor' and the 'undeserving poor' and disabled (Stone, 1986).

In the eighteenth century capitalism in the form of industrialisation, commercialisation of land and agriculture brought a significant medical societal change towards disability discrimination. It also triggered the philosophy of the Enlightenment and Liberal Utilitarianism across the UK. This philosophical belief contained a critique of established religions. Value was based on reason and science, social-progress was a responsibility and individuality were considered a significant issue.

Proposing a philosophy based on secularism and rationality of self-interest legitimates policies that favour the majority at the expense of the few (Berlin, 1956, Himmelfarb, 2008), suggesting that disabled people may become more vulnerable.

In the nineteenth century, the combination of the previously established myths and practices towards disability and the development of the above philosophy, activated the medicalisation of disability (Armstrong, 1983, Barnes, 1997a). This medical individualisation of disability resulted in a different form of disabled people's discrimination in mainstream of society, materializing in institutionalization and eugenics (Scott, 1981). Hence, considering any kind of physical and/or intellectual disability was a threat to society and to eradicate propagation, eugenic ideals were developed during the first half of the twentieth century (Searle, 1979, Kevles, 1985, Jones, 1986). This encouraged the murder of thousands of disabled people in the Nazi death-camps of the 1930s and 40s (Gallaghet, 1990, Burleigh, 1994). There was also an upsurge in religious humanitarian causes among the rich, giving rise to many charity organizations, especially for disabled people, because they were considered underprivileged. For example, in 1863 the Royal National Institute for the Blind (RNIB) was founded in the UK (Barnes, 1997a), demonstrating the complicated impact of politics, culture and economy when trying to create independency for disabled people in society (Oliver, 1990b).

However, during the 1940s, following the Second World War, Great Britain was developing a welfare state, resulting in positive changes in the political climate and economic policies favouring disabled people. This was anticipated by the humanitarian and philanthropic work done for disabled ex-servicemen during and after the World Wars (Harris et al., 1971). The 1944 Disabled Persons Employment Act (DPEA) was instigated, which proposed that within a workforce of 20 persons, 3% of disabled people should be employed, obliging the local-authorities to encourage employers to hire disabled people (MOL, 1946). This was the beginning of the politicisation of disability by disabled people and their organisations (Pagel, 1988, Campbell and Oliver, 1996).

During the 1960s, disability was beginning to be reconceptualised as a social and political problem (Miller and Gwynne, 1972, Finkelstein, 1988, Oliver, 1990a, Barnes, 1997a, Grue, 2011). By the early 1970s, disabled and able-bodied, activist and academics began interrogating societal barriers, like education, employment and architecture in society (Barnes, 1997a, Lamond, 2017). The Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation (UPIAS, 1976), Welfare-Reform of the Scandinavian Countries (Grue, 2011) and the sociological writings of I.K. Zola (Longmore, 2003: 57), portrayed disability as caused by the social environments. These circumstances produced the Disabled People's Movement (DPM) in the UK, whose aim was to challenge social exclusions and include disabled people in mainstream society (Germon, 2010). For example, Leach (1996: 88) stated that the DPM

intends to ‘raise disability rights as a political issue’, challenging exclusion of disabled people. This forced governments and public organizations to consider disabled people’s needs and rights, providing appropriate information to arrange for adequate services for disabled people, like transport, housing and education (Oliver and Barnes, 1997b).

In the 1980s the Independent Living Movement supported disabled people’s housing, personal-assistance, mobility/transport, employment, technical-equipment (Evans, 2003). Also in 1983, within the DPM, the disabled academic Mike Oliver coined the phrase ‘social model of disability’ (Oliver et al., 2012), thus, conceptualising disability as a socially constructed problem (Stark, 2009).

2.5 Disability as an Academic Discipline

Understanding of disability through material considerations and cultural perceptions in society (Barnes and Mercer, 1997b), initiated the establishment of researching disability as an academic discipline (Oliver, 1998a). For example, according to the UPIAS, disability is the exclusion of disabled people from the mainstream society (UPIAS, 1976: 14). The purpose of the discipline is to activate new academic inquiry and knowledge production of ‘human experience, altering, refining or subverting old-truths’ (Grue, 2011: 533). Consequently, disability research from a social perspective assists policy-makers and politicians in the creation of policies preventing discrimination (Doyle, 1995, NOG, 1996). The main focus of the discipline is to develop disability politics, models of disability, considered further below.

2.6 Background of the Models of Disability

As mentioned above, disabled people were historically considered as ‘unfortunate, useless, different, oppressed and sick’ (Hunt, 1966: 156), because having an impairment or a biological lack or functional limitations requires medical diagnosis and treatment or rehabilitation to become normal, according to the able-bodied standards and expectations (Finkelstein, 1980, Oliver, 1990b, Gleeson, 1997, Roulstone, 2003, Campbell and Oliver, 2013). Hence, creating a negative outlook towards disability, because it influenced decision-making of disabled people’s own requirements, particularly in employment and education (Barnes, 2004, Oliver, 2004a).

Disabled people are still perceived by the able-bodied to be incapable of benefiting or contributing to society’s economic prosperity, enabling stigmatisation as a minority group. Similarly, making disability an individual deficit outcome was an approach adopted towards researching disability academically (Oliver and Sapey, 1983, Barnes, 1996). Therefore, according to Oliver (1996b: 32) disability was portrayed as a ‘terrible chance event occurring at random to unfortunate individuals’, locating disabled people as victims (Oliver, 1990b). Disability was initially understood in terms of two distinct models: the individual medicalised model and the social model, which are discussed in the next section. The critique of these models is considered further in Chapter four.

2.7 The two main Models of Disability

2.8 Development of the individual medicalised model of disability

As noted above, during the 18th century treating illnesses and discovering remedies became a science (Richard, 2004). The assumption was that the needs for disabled people are better served in separate institutions with specialized equipment, like care homes, which became the dominant hegemonic ideology, empowering the medical professions to dictate the social lives of disabled individuals (Brisenden, 1986b). Although, it cannot be denied that medical science has kept disabled people alive and has succeeded in reducing pain and discomfort (Oliver, 1990a, Clapton and Fitzgerald, 2011).

Such an understanding of disability led it to be researched and investigated as a problem within the individual's impaired body, aiming to achieve normalization through medicalisation to operate within the social world dominated by the ideal of the able-bodied (Swain et al., 2014). For example, academic research within medical and educational professions focussed on needing disability to be fixed (Farber, 1986, Gleeson, 1997, Finkelstein, 2001c). This conceptualisation eventually gave rise to a dominant understanding of disability referred to by its critics as the individual medicalised model of disability (Oliver, 1990a) which achieved the `ideological hegemony', translated into everyday assumptions and beliefs, for example media, language and cultural representations of disabled people (Gramsci, 1971c, Oliver, 1986, Oliver, 1992, Heyer, 2007).

As the dominant model, the individual medicalised conception of disability was 'extremely significant to the lives of disabled people' in shaping expectations, perceptions and attitudes towards able-bodied people, as they continue to be assessed against conceptions of 'normality' that is non-disability (Shah, 2005: 23). However, gradually this dominant ideology towards disability was refuted by disabled people themselves and then by progressive movements in society, which encouraged disability to be reviewed and analysed from a social perspective.

This led to developing an alternative model based on the social interpretation of disability and a political justification of disability, which was originally designed and developed by disabled people themselves, rejecting all of the above fundamentals, which 'does not deny the problem of impairment, but locates it squarely within society. Consequently, disability does not randomly fall on individuals, but systematically upon disabled people who, collectively/as a group, 'experience this failure as discrimination institutionalised throughout society' (Oliver, 1990a: 3). This was the basis of a social model, which considers physical environmental barriers, as well as negative social attitudes of people in society, that disabled people collectively encounter and which result in oppression, exclusion and discrimination of disabled people. Central to this argument was the view that disability needs to be understood as a lived social experience, instead of relying on medical treatments (Bury,

1996, Finkelstein, 2007). According to Brisenden (1986b: 2), 'Our experiences must be expressed by ourselves and then integrated in the consciousness of mainstream society and this goes against the accumulated sediment of a social world that is steeped in the (individual medicalised) medical model' (Brisenden, 1986b: 2).

2.9 Towards the Social Model of Disability

As noted above, In the 1960s a refreshed understanding of disability was under development by disabled people themselves, because it was insufficient to reduce disabled people to just their bodily impairments and beyond its remit to impose separate social standards for disabled people. This was a prominent confrontational challenge to the medical model and a highly empowering and emancipating political move towards the traditional dominant hegemonic ideology of disability. The rebellion began from institutionalisation by disabled people themselves living in the Leonard Cheshire Homes (Tanaka, 2007), a residential institution for disabled people, providing care to those who were considered unable to care for themselves (Mason, 1955-1964). At this residential institution the disabled people were excluded and were labelled as socially-dead (Morris, 2005). However, change began to occur when some of the residents rejected advice from medical experts, who were making decisions for disabled people regarding their lives (Miller and Gwynne, 1972). This confrontation consequently led to the interrogation of expert medical advice, which was the beginning of the formation of a radical resistance movement called the Disabled People's Movement (DPM). The aim of the DPM was to challenge their rights and exclusion from mainstream society (Leach, 1996). Additionally, they were also responsible for influencing matters of social policies and practises which directly affected the lives of the disabled people (Germon, 2010). According to Lang (2007: 4), 'disability is the result of society's failure to provide adequate and appropriate services. Consequently, the needs of disabled people are not adequately accounted for within the contemporary social organization of society'.

This history provides the context for the development of the social model, demonstrating the influence it has in society and academia and on this thesis. Since their development, both the individual medicalised and social models have been subject to debates and controversies around interpretations of the models. The social model of disability has come under criticism from philosophical ideologies of disabled feminists, post-structuralist/modernist and academic debates from sociology of health and illness. There have also been different interpretations of the social model in in different parts of the world, like the US, UK and Scandinavia. These shall be further discussed in Chapter Four, the theoretical and conceptual framework for the thesis.

2.10 Conclusion

This Chapter has contributed towards answering one of the research questions i.e. 'Why and how does the history of attitudes towards disability influence employment of disabled academics?' For this purpose, it has reviewed the disability literature, focusing on the history of disabled people. First by establishing disability through a medical perspective, then, through a social interpretation, identifying the emergence of the social model from the work of the DPM and the rejection of an individual interpretation the medical model of disability. The social model is recognized for eradicating social barriers and changing attitudes in society. Also, within academia, it has developed new perspectives towards researching disability and problematizing the individualized interpretations of disability as biological or functional limitations. In brief, the individualised medical and social models of disability remain the dominant understandings and representation of disability and disabled people, a theorization of disability by disabled academics and their non-disabled academic associates (Goodley, 2016, Gallagher et al., 2014). Throughout this thesis, disability is seen through the lens of the social model, where, the social model suggests that disability is caused by social barriers and people's attitudes towards disability. This will be used when analysing the empirical data of the three University case-studies, in order to determine whether the policies and practises adopted by the participating Universities improves the employment for all disabled academic employees. Therefore, it is important to understand disability and investigate disabled people's social experiences like employment, along with major implications for social intervention in the twenty first century.

The next Chapter focuses on the in-accessibilities experienced by disabled employees before focussing on the academic workplace.

3.0 Chapter Three: Now Please! Disability Equality at the Workplace

3.1 Introduction

In the previous Chapter disability history highlighted how intense oppression within society and its impact on society led to the development of the DPM and the emergence of the social model. 'A reaction to the dominant medical model' (Paley, 2002: 189) and recognition that all barriers, either purposely or inadvertently, are imposed by society (Oliver, 1990a).

This Chapter shapes the approach developed towards the inclusion of disability focusing on employment for disabled people within the workplace. The objective is to review the workplace diversity management literature, to investigate an appropriate approach for the inclusion of disability within the university workplace and to contextualise an understanding of disabled academics' employment.

For this purpose, the Chapter begins with an overview of diversity management, a crucial principle in Human Resource (HR) management and an essential characteristic of the workplace. However, disability has been much neglected within diversity management, which is further discussed in this chapter. The chapter explores the business case for employing and retaining disabled people at the workplace before specifically considering the academic workplace. Lastly, it provides an overview of the barriers faced by disabled academics within the employment environment. The objective is to address, through the literature, the practical, ethical, social and conceptual barriers encountered by disabled academics, conducting research to identify factors shaping the work of disabled people (Seymour, 2007).

3.2 What is a Workplace?

A workplace is the physical location that contains organizational structures, processes, procedures, practices that shape social relationships and creates institutions between employers and employees and amongst employees (Clegg and Bailey, 2008, Sydow and Schreyögg, 2015). In the past the primary concern of research on the workplace was on the improvement towards management's efficiency and effectiveness (Rothmann and Cooper, 2015). However, contemporary research on the workplace is measured and judged from the welfare of employees, suggesting the focus should not be entirely on economic development or profitability of the workplace. The employee's well-being and participation is recognised, suggesting that investigating a workplace automatically involves identifying the workplace structures that may be damaging and their consequences for employees. The use of power, social inequality and its effects on workplace-performance has also included the management of sexuality, race, gender (Burrell, 1984, Hearn et al., 1989, Mills et al., 1993, Hearn and Parkin, 1995, Acker, 2006, McBride et al., 2015). Although, there is much research done on these social categories, there is not much done on disability in the workplace and disabled people

are significantly underrepresented within employment research (Foster and Fosh, 2010, Williams and Mavin, 2012). It is argued that employment environments reflect the traditional cultural and social understanding that the workplace is constructed on 'able-ness' (Rose, 1988, Morgan, 1997), excluding those who are perceived as disabled and 'incompetent' (Oliver, 1984) and creating a distinction between the capable and incapable (Foster and Wass, 2012, Foster and Scott, 2015).

3.3 Invisibility of Disability in the Workplace

Historically, a perfect employee has been defined 'scientifically and empirically, as a generic ideal-worker' in a workplace (Foster and Wass, 2012: 1), because 'at the core of any theory of industrial behaviour lies an image of the typical worker' (Rose, 1988: 26). Therefore, an ideal or universal worker should be strong, male, white and healthy (Weber, 1964, Acker, 1990, Bedeian, 2007, Williams and Mavin, 2015). There is only 'a small body of literature investigating issues of disability' (Thanem, 2008: 581), perhaps, because disabled people do not make up a significant proportion of the workforce, keeping them invisible. Currently, within the UK out of 65.64 million people, 1.3 million disabled people are available for and want to work, but are more likely to be unemployed (DWP, 2016, Rees and Smith, 2017). Furthermore, economically inactive disabled people want to find work, even when they have not worked for a long-time, but do not expect to find work in the near future (Grewal et al., 2002, IPPR, 2003, Howard, 2003, Gulliford, 2015).

Statistics given above suggest that disability within the employment context creates a stigma, which occupies conceptualisations of the ideal employee in ways than other social groups do not occupy (Woodhams and Danieli, 2000). This is inherent when disability is viewed as a deficit or a lack in the human body. It contradicts the nature of the ideal worker, as it limits ability, flexibility and efficiency, creating a gap between the ideal worker and the disabled employee. Such stigmatisation of disability creates a reason for the exclusion of disabled employees by their managers and employers (Foster and Fosh, 2010).

Contrary to the employment statistics for disabled workers and critical theories of the ideal worker, research on diversity and inclusion explores the social experiences of employees, assisting in the development of E&D workplace policy for disabled workers, which was neglected in the past (Baldridge and Kulkarni, 2017). Such a process takes place through the visible and non-visible differences, like sex, age, background, race, disability, personality and employee's work style. There is evidence that undertaking such analysis at the workplace, enhances employment performance and decreases costs (Mulholland, 2004, Downey et al., 2015).

3.4 What is Diversity Management (DM) within the Workplace?

Traditionally, equal opportunities signified a moral concern for social justice (Miller, 1994). However, it was criticised as a negative approach, focussing on the associated problems, such as discrimination, bias, affirmative-action and tokenism (Liff, 1997, Shore et al., 2009, Shore et al., 2011, Jackson and Joshi, 2011). The focus was not only on social justice, but also redressing past wrongs, correcting 'an imbalance, an injustice, a mistake' (Thomas Jr, 1990: 108). Organisations were required to demonstrate compliance with the law to avoid penalties but were not compelled to actually promote equality. Even though advocates of DM do not propose abandoning the social justice principles of equal opportunities, by the mid-1990s DM was considered the new way forward for the workplace (McDougall, 1996, Adler and Aycan, 2018).

DM literature argues that a workforce that consists of a diverse population, consisting of visible and non-visible differences (Linton et al., 2015). Differences 'such as disability, thinking ability, creativity, types of intelligence, languages, spoken, gender, age, sexual-orientation, educational-background, socioeconomic-status, learning-styles, and physical-ability' (Muyia et al., 2010: 397), can be positively managed because 'harnessing these differences will create a productive environment in which everybody feels valued, where their talents are being fully utilized and in which organizational (workplace) goals are met' (Kandola and Fullerton, 1994: 8). The objective is to treat people as individuals, recognizing that each employee has different needs and requires different kinds of help to succeed (Geber, 1992, Ross and Schneider, 1992). It is suggested that the workplace can gain in a number of different ways, for example, emphasizing individual difference over social group based differences downplays discrimination and disadvantage, while being optimistic about the positive dimension/protected-characteristics of group based-differences (McDougall, 1996). Furthermore, by simultaneously delivering benefits to the workplace, DM draws on a business case (Cornelius et al., 2001), creating a competitive advantage in areas like marketing, problem-solving and resource-acquisition (Cox, 2001).

Diversity in the workplace is considered to be inclusion of all employees from various backgrounds into the formal and informal structures of the workplace1 through deliberate practices (Chemers et al., 1995, Giovannini, 2004, Barak, 2010). These practices may include a variety of initiatives, like staff and workplace programs and benefits such as flexible work arrangements, domestic partner benefits, corporate sponsored employee and other programs designed to attract and retain a diverse workforce (CLC, 2003). It is also considered to make employees more productive and more representative of their organization (Selden and Selden, 2001, Barak, 2016). Likewise, Cox (1993: 11) defined it as 'planning and implementing organizational (workplace) systems and practices to manage people so that the potential advantages of diversity are maximized, while potential

disadvantages are minimized'. Thus, de-emphasizing conflicts, problems and dilemmas involved in implementing meaningful initiatives and practises (Elmes et al., 1997).

Currently, DM is becoming increasingly integrated into the mainstream workplace, influenced by diverse social movements (Colgan and Ledwith, 2000, Foster and Fosh, 2010). Workplaces are trying to increase their workforce diversity, because of its perceived positive outcomes on the workplace (Milliken and Martins, 1996, Van Knippenberg and Schippers, 2007, Shemla et al., 2016). It is considered to increase the knowledge perspectives and ideas that are available as inputs into creative processes and decision making, thus, enhancing employee performance at the workplace (Williams and O'Reilly, 1998). Although, it is also debated that DM assists in the development of a business case rationale, replacing features of the social justice case (Noon, 2007), such claims need to be further investigated (Cox and Blake, 1991, Richard, 2000, Ely and Thomas, 2001, Joshi and Roh, 2009), since they have significant implications for whether the workplace is helped or harmed (Thomas Jr and Roosevelt, 1990, Cox, 1993, Konrad and Linnehan, 1995, Richard and Johnson, 2001), which is the focus of the next section.

3.5 The Implications of DM

DM is practiced primarily by employers to ensure that equality is in the business's interest (Dickens, 1999). However, DM is based on 'ideological positioning' of employees (Tomlinson and Schwabenland, 2010: 104), because it 'is politically charged' (Noon, 2007: 774). One explanation is it was designed in a functionalist paradigm, privileging and universalizing managerial interests (Sinclair, 2006), only interested in recognizing those differences that advantage increasing financial benefits to the workplace (Zanoni and Janssens, 2007). Therefore, DM 'enshrines the achievement of [the workplace's] economic-goals as the ultimate guiding principle and explanatory device for people in [the workplace]' (Litvin, 2005: 86).

Yet, it is also suggested that DM evolved as 'a story of how to obtain both equality and business success; it depicts a win-win situation where these two perspectives are united' (Kamp and Hagedorn-Rasmussen, 2004: 532). Such claims towards DM might positively affect the business outcomes of the workplace, accomplished through employees displaying a range of work perspectives (Richard, 2000), thus, producing superior outcomes, because progress and innovation depends on diverse employees working-together.

DM also assists in encouraging decision-making, predictions and overcoming communication barriers, because employees can relate to one another's functions while still realizing the performance benefits of the workplace (Bunderson and Sutcliffe, 2002). Diversity may therefore increase the opportunity for creativity and improve the employee's quality of performance (Williams

and O'Reilly, 1998, DiTomaso et al., 2007). Additionally, application of DM may benefit beyond the workplace, influencing the perceptions of consumers regarding their purchasing practices (Sen and Bhattacharya, 2001). It is therefore linked to positive outcomes at the workplace, allowing the workplace to 'think outside the box, by bringing previously excluded groups inside the box', improving creativity, problem-solving and performance (Herring, 2009: 220). For this purpose, DM also potentially includes disabled employees within the workplace, which will be discussed in the next section.

3.6 Managing disability in DM

The factors that influence employment patterns and outcomes of diversity in the labour market are the main sources of discrimination and disadvantage within employment (Patrick and Kumar, 2012). The integration of disabled employees has been particularly neglected (Foster and Fosh, 2010), perhaps because, historically, there was this generic concept of an ideal worker having all four limbs and good health (Rose, 1975) accompanied by a traditional belief-system with assumptions about the problems of employing disabled people (Foster and Wass, 2012, Williams and Mavin, 2012). This has created an inherent ableism, where the able body is privileged and preferred, whereas the disabled body is believed to be too different and problematic to be included within the workplace (Foster, 2007). For example, Humphrey (1998: 588) describes disabled employees as constituting 'a political and cultural forgetfulness' in the workplace. Not accommodating disability would create marginalization. However, truly understanding DM within the workplace would include incorporating all dimensions of diversity/protected-characteristics, including disability. This would involve the implementation of necessary inclusive practises within the workplace, eradicating stigma towards employing or terminating the employment of disabled people (Brodwin, 2008).

DM within the workplace is a gradual process, encouraging employers and managers to critically examine themselves and implement inclusive practises (Cascio, 2018). This requires addressing and meeting the needs of a changing constituency through taking the responsibility of being active participants in social change within and beyond the workplace. It is argued that, especially in the case of disability, it means exercising social conscience within the workplace, so the members of the workforce are already responsive towards eradication of disability discrimination, rather than reactive agents (Olkin, 2002). This would positively address the important issues and concerns of disabled employees, evolving an effective social environment towards disability inclusion.

It is argued that DM enhances the cost-efficiency and workplace effectiveness by creating an environment that is receptive and adaptive towards disability and does not hesitate in changing the workplace values and roles (Thanem, 2008). The argument is then that the intrinsic benefits of DM

can result in practises based on inclusion and acceptance of disabled employees. Commitment to such workplace diversity practises can demonstrate engagement with systems that perpetuate inclusion and equality, giving rise to increased toleration, understanding and accepting disability. Valuing diversity and appreciating differences within the workplace, as they are associated with heritage, characteristics and employees' values, encourages diversification (Barak, 2016).-However, reasonable adjustments can be obstructed by manager's restrictive interpretations (Foster, 2007, Fevre et al., 2013, Schur et al., 2013, Foster and Scott, 2015). Even when managers have the knowledge, goodwill and positive attitude to implement reasonable adjustments, sometimes they are responsible for enforcing policies to manage disabled employees' absenteeism. This may include whether to take harsh disciplinary actions towards disabled employees, (Cunningham et al., 2004, Dobbin, 2009, Foster and Fosh, 2010) and hesitancy towards implementing appropriate reasonable adjustments. DM can therefore create tensions between the disabled employee and the employer, leading to unconscious harassment of disabled employees (Fevre et al., 2013) and preserve the superiority of ableism in the workplace (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009). For example, it is argued that managers belonging to dominant political power relations at the workplace may maintain the equality illusion, but in reality display contradictory understanding of disability (Goodley, 2016). Therefore, DM can be a valuable tool towards impacting, changing, modelling and accepting a positive disability-friendly workplace, but only if it is authentic.

3.7 Disability, the Business case or Social justice case for the Workplace?

As noted above, the objective of DM is associated with the business case that focuses on workplace profitability, accomplished through the inclusive and non-discriminatory workplace policies and practices, creating social justice (Dickens, 1999, Litvin, 2005, Pompper, 2013). However, when regarding disability, there is a tension (Tomlinson and Schwabenland, 2010), as it can possibly deny the legitimacy and importance of the social justice case (LaurenB Edelman et al., 2001).

For example, a survey by Burchardt (2003a) suggested that of 53 employers, 79% reported that they were concerned about the costs of reasonable adjustments. Employing disabled people is assumed to incur tremendous support costs and a perceived risk of financial expenditure is reinforced (Bardasi et al., 2000). This demonstrates a tension between the social justice case and the business case in the workplace. Therefore, avoiding the implementation of reasonable adjustments, might frustrate 'equality outcomes and might ultimately prove to be dangerous for social justice' (Noon, 2007: 773). Such a perception is due to a lack of understanding of reasonable adjustments, believing changes would be large and costly (Russell, 2006). However, there is a budget that allows the government to contribute towards the cost of implementing reasonable adjustments when employing disabled people (Sayce, 2011). Every year the government spends £7 million on

supporting reasonable adjustments, like the Access-to-Work programme assisting disabled people's employment by providing practical support in overcoming work-related obstacles (DWP, 2017).

It is conceded that advocating a total barrier removal approach would be a huge task, causing much disturbance, as the entire workplace would have to be examined and then adapted accordingly (Shakespeare, 2006a). It would require regular maintenance of the premises by installing lifts, induction loops, mini-coms, flashing fire alarms, addressing badly lit areas, specialist fire evacuation procedures, ensuring accessibility and updating work station ergonomics designs. Making all these changes would require a great deal of workplace disruption. Furthermore, regular assessments of changes are disruptive (Woodhams and Danieli, 2000). It is far more convenient to neglect the employment of disabled people, omitting disability altogether, by suggesting that their inclusion and accommodation in the workplace is problematic and damaging towards the profitability of the workplace (Townley, 1994). These perceptions undermine DM, suggesting that advocacy of the business case necessarily weakens the social justice case (Sinclair, 2006) because they have 'contradictory-logics' (Ahmed, 2007a: 242).

However, it is also possible for the social justice case to 'coexist' and harmonise along with the business case (Tomlinson and Schwabenland, 2010: 102, Barmes and Ashtiany, 2003, Maxwell, 2004). There is a possibility that a business case, along with a social justice-case, can be recognised towards disabled people's employment (Godwin, 2006, Dobusch, 2017). For example, Goldman Sachs has benefited from improving workplace accessibility, which they claim encourages access to new ideas, increased competition and better value for money along with improved economic visibility and participation and growth of under-represented business communities (BDF, 2013, BDF, 2014). According, to Needels and Schmitz (2006), Sin et al. (2009), and Dewson et al. (2005), there are also further benefits like widening the number of potential recruits, thus increasing the chances of getting the right person for the job, retaining employees and saving on recruitment and costs, improving access to disabled customers, boosting staff morale, loyalty and commitment, making the business more representative of the community and fostering an image of a fair and inclusive employer, which improves the workplace image (EHRC, 2012, Hall and Wilton, 2015).

Hence, when the workplace is based on the principles of DM it represents hospitable and accessibility towards disability and disabled employees' potential (Oliver, 1996a, Comini et al., 2012). The next section will further discuss the benefits of employing and retaining disabled people in the workplace.

3.8 Hiring and Retaining Disabled employees Benefits the Workplace

> 'Someone who has a disability, and who has been through absolute hell (looking for work), if you're going to offer them a job, they're going to stay for a heck of a lot longer. You're giving them the time to be happy there' (Inequality, 2017: 1).

Disabled people want to use their untapped potential abilities, would like to be employed and remain in employment (Adams, 2010, Hollomotz, 2013), which gives rise to many available skills for workplace advancement. Furthermore, their employment assists in improving the workplace reputation within the society they share and serve (Moon, 2013), simultaneously increasing a wider customer range (Waller et al., 2015). Hiring and retaining disabled people enhances the image and corporate vision of the workplace, maintaining a contemporary, forward thinking ethos that appeals to other employees (Payne, 2010). However, it is impossible and illogical to assume that market economies would follow ethical regulation, ensuring E&D at all times (Wrench, 2005, Tatli, 2011).

Regular attendance is one of the crucial factors that employers expect from good employees and disabled employees are recognized for better attendance and less absentees than non-disabled employees (Smith et al., 2004). Furthermore they demonstrate and exhibit better safety records and higher performance levels, equal to or even better than their non-disabled colleagues (Minskoff et al., 1987, Braddock and Bachelder, 1994, Mackay, 1995, Greenwald and Banaji, 1995, Unger and Kregel, 2003). All of these factors lead to reducing turnover costs, retaining a competitive advantage resulting from a well-trained and knowledgeable workforce, decreasing litigation costs and negative effects on employee morale, enhancing customer goodwill and community image and ameliorating the impending labour shortage (Janssens and Zanoni, 2005, Suter et al., 2007, Brodwin, 2008).

From the evidence above, it is proclaimed that disabled employees would bring different experiences and problem solving perspectives to the workplace, as they are often successful innovators as a result of contending with an inaccessible world (McFarlin et al., 1991). Also, 'diversity drives innovation' (Johansson, 2013: 1), hence, a diverse-workplace, is more creative. Therefore, employers and managers should have no excuse for not having disabled employees (Schur, 2002), as they are as productive and often more productive than non-disabled (Scott-Parker and Zadek, 2001b, Stone and Colella, 1996, Hall, 2002a, Katz, 2014).

So far, this Chapter highlights the importance of integrating disability within the workplace. Furthermore, it is also debated that in order to destroy inequality within the workplace, barriers for the marginalised disabled employees need to be understood and acknowledged (McDonald et al., 2013) to implement DM accordingly. This argument is reviewed in the next section, focusing on the

disabled academics' employment with its entrenched practical, ethical, social and conceptual in-accessibilities.

3.9 Employment of the disabled academics

Researching disability is crucial, to the study of the dynamic strands of E&D like ethnicity, gender, race or sexuality (Brown and Boardman, 2010). It is a developing interest, holding a recognised status within the social sciences and offering researchers the opportunity to investigate and develop legislation, practises and policies. Furthermore, it gives disabled people a voice and contributes to challenging the dominant politically motivated conventional objectivity (Humphries, 2000). However, there is limited literature found on disabled academics (Williams and Mavin, 2015). Few academic articles concentrate on equality issues for disabled staff and students within Higher Education (HE) (Abbott et al., 2005, Deem et al., 2005, Moore et al., 2013, Shepherd, 2017).

Due to prevailing economic and market-forces, employment within academia is fluctuating, regardless of being disabled or non-disabled (Oliver and Barnes, 1997d, Stromquist and Monkman, 2014), leading to a competitive intensity in research contracts and the control of funding provision for academic research (Cooper and Kleinschmidt, 1986, Jain et al., 2009). This has contributed to 'Determining who is able to do disability research and who is not' (Oliver and Barnes, 1997d: 811) and intensified the employment issues for disabled academics (Barnes, 2014b). Hence, if disability research is to continue, the employment of disabled academics must be well maintained. The next section turns to naming the employment barriers and the workplace improvements required for disabled academics.

3.10 Physical and Environmental Barriers

Providing an accessible route for disabled academics within the workplace requires alterations to remove physical and environmental barriers in the form of reasonable adjustments. For example, research undertaken by a blind or deaf academic would need a support-worker or an interpreter to assist them with composing their research-work since the overwhelming bulk of published data is available only in inaccessible formats. The costs of assistance would need to cover converting, then transcription of this data into accessible formats. Another example would be of accommodating an intermittent, unpredictable or degenerative disability, which may require a flexible, less demanding work schedule and technical equipment to aid the disabled academic. Furthermore, new-technology is also used (Roulstone, 2015) for assisting disabled academic employees. For example, provision of technical-aids and equipment (Anjoyeb, 2016). Although these may prove to be expensive, both in terms of cost and time, the disabled academic should not be expected to meet these requirements

themselves. Instead, these reasonable adjustment accommodations should be built into the research budget provided by the funding bodies (Oliver and Barnes, 1997c, Stewart et al., 1998).

It is a legal right to request for reasonable adjustments (Foster, 2007, Hepple, 2014) to be provided by the funding-bodies. However, due to economic and financial crisis, this may be partially refused or fully rejected, suggesting that other financial resources need to be investigated (Oliver and Barnes, 1997c). Reasonable adjustments may also be refused by managers because of a workplace disruption or misunderstanding or through a lack of action (Jammaers et al., 2016). When requests are dealt informally, responses are subjectively decided upon and often not followed-up, discouraging disabled academics and damaging their employment progression (Harlan and Robert, 1998, Foster and Scott, 2015).

Even when reasonable adjustments are agreed and provided, they are not necessarily effectively managed either because of an irresponsible attitude or abandonment by unsympathetic managers. An empowerment strategy to enable disabled academics/employees to manage their own in-accessibilities should therefore be put in place by employers and funding bodies (Foster, 2007). Oliver and Barnes (1997d: 812) argue that 'one of the key features of a disabling society is that disabled workers are expected to perform like super-cripples, in order to hold down a job'. To ameliorate this, reasonable adjustments 'need to be taken into account when drawing up research timetables' (Oliver and Barnes, 1997d: 812). Therefore, the role of the employer or the funding bodies is to actively apply and manage reasonable adjustments within the research funding process, particularly for disabled academics/employees experiencing fluctuating or unpredictable effects of disability (Jenkins and Rigg, 2004). This will help to ensure that disabled academics do not fear risking losing employment and stay in employment, especially post-disability acquisition (Burchardt, 2003b).

3.11 Behaviours and Attitudes

Behaviours and attitudes towards disabled academics assist in shaping good or bad relationships with managers and colleagues (Morgan, 2017) by facilitating inclusivity or ableism that create enablement or constraint within academia (Lloyd et al., 1996, Moore et al., 1998). This can include both undermining or favouring disabled people in employment (French, 2001, Roulstone, 2003, Wilson-Kovacs et al., 2008). This happens when behaviours and attitudes create social relationship differences, which overtime, become transparent understandings and normal expectations (Faubion, 1994, Saunders and Nedelec, 2014) and consequently lead to the construction of inclusive or non-inclusive employment practices for disabled people (Mawdsley and Lewis, 2017). Therefore, to ensure the equitable employment of disabled academics, social-norms have to be corrected, able-bodied managers' and academics' attitudes and behaviour need to be positive towards disability, in

order to eradicate disability discrimination, negation and marginalization. Furthermore, the involvement and participation of disabled academic employees is required to incorporate positive behaviours, attitudes interaction, collaboration and inclusion (Lamont and Molnár, 2002, Roulstone, 2003) of managers and employers.

3.12 Disability disclosure

Disability disclosure is necessary in creating awareness and recognition of visibility or invisibility of disability (von Schrader et al., 2014). It is required to identify and implement appropriate reasonable adjustments within the workplace and to develop policies and practices in relation to levels of inclusion or exclusion towards disability (Felsinger and Byford, 2010). However, disability disclosure is sometimes understood and recognised as a negative identity, suggesting a hesitancy towards disability disclosure, due to the fear of rejection (Gewin, 2011), which leads to a dilemma for disabled workers as to whether or not to declare their disability. The dilemma is exacerbated for disabled employees, if they look externally well, even though experiencing difficulty internally (Fitzgerald, 2000).

In order to avoid all these issues, disability in the academic workplace needs to be viewed as approachable and unbiased (Burnell and Schnackenberg, 2015). Only then will disabled academics feel they can discontinue from hiding their disability or reluctance towards disability disclosure that is a disservice to themselves. If DM is practiced in the workplace disabled academics should confidently embrace their disability, be frank and open about their needs and requirements, because 'the most creative insights come from people who think about the world differently' (Gewin, 2011: 2).

3.13 Awareness and promotion

Awareness and promotion of disability within academia, should be actively pursued (Barnes, 2014b, Eckersley et al., 2016). Although there are funding bodies eligible to cover extra assistance costs, lack of promotion and absence of awareness mean they are largely untapped and unknown to disabled academics. For example, the research funding scheme Erasmus facilitates disabled academics in doing research. However, due to lack of awareness and promotion of Erasmus, out of 198,523 potential academics only 213 applied and received research funding during 2008–09 (Erasmus, 2012). There are many similar grants and schemes available for disabled academics, but due to absence of proper promotion and awareness they are left unconsidered (Shakespeare and Watson, 2001, Mercer, 2002, Oliver, 2017).

3.14 Improving the academic environment

> 'Until the 1990s, most British universities were virtually inaccessible to disabled students and staff' (Barnes, 2007: 135).

It is crucial to create employment opportunities within academia, to interest disabled people to become academics (Borsay, 2005). Inaccessibility to funding is a major issue covered in disability research literature (Oliver, 1997, Kirkham et al., 2016). To overcome this, it is necessary for funding bodies to genuinely understand and recognise the sensitive nature of disability to encourage disabled academic's employment. For this purpose, constructive and accessible policies with the appropriate understanding and application of legislation towards disability needs to be adopted when employing disabled academic

3.15 Conclusion

This Chapter has addressed one of the research questions: 'How is disability hegemonized within equality policies and practices in the workplace?' by drawing on literature on disabled employees and barriers in the workplace. The analysis was extended to the employment of disabled academics to set the context of this thesis.

The focus is on the negation of disabled employees, starting with the historical perception that only an able-bodied person can be employed within a workplace (Rose, 1988, Woodhams and Danieli, 2000, Foster and Wass, 2012). The concept and purpose of DM is discussed in detail, highlighting its aim to develop a wider pool of employees, performing better through strategic practises and policies, but linked closely to a business case that considers the accommodation of disabled people important to prioritize a more competitive position in the marketplace (Hansen, 2003).

In relation to disabled academics' employment, the analysis focuses on specific examples of inaccessibility, like the funding bodies having a major hand in limiting the participation of disabled academics. The Chapter continues by providing an overview of the barriers faced by disabled academics within the workplace, particularly around the provision of reasonable adjustments. The analysis provides a standpoint for investigating the experiences of the disabled academic participants of the three University case-studies in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten.

The next Chapter explains the theoretical and conceptual framework developed in this thesis, which includes the synthesis of the two main disability models, the liberal and radical approaches to equality and Gramscian theories.

4.0 Chapter Four: The Theoretical and Conceptual framework

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a theoretical and conceptual framework that is used for the analysis of this thesis, which will contribute to the second part of the main research question:

> *What are the barriers and enablers to the employment of disabled academics and what theoretical frameworks can be adopted to understand them?*

The chapter begins by arguing that disabled people are not passive or inactive when receiving society's oppression, but in fact actively pursue challenges and work towards bringing a change (Imrie, 1996). In order to understand oppression in the form of disabling effects or functions in society, the models of disability play a crucial role (Finkelstein, 2007, Oliver, 1990a, Paterson, 2001) as discussed in Chapter Two. Now, the focus is on the controversies causing limitation of these two models, along with critically examining the liberal and radical approaches to equality in a workplace, which have different styles and implementation techniques (Jewson and Mason, 1986) regarding policies, procedures and practises towards disability (Riddell, 2009). Following this critical analysis, the political theories of Antonio Gramsci are used to reconceptualise theoretical approaches to disability. His theories of ideology, good-sense, common-sense, hegemony and the role of organic and traditional-intellectuals are relevant to this research, providing a broader understanding of disabled academics' university workplace employment. Crucially, Gramascian theories are used to justify the gaps identified in the limitations of the models of disability and critical analysis of the liberal and radical equality approaches.

4.2 Controversies and Criticisms causing Limitations around the Models of Disability

Noted in Chapter Two, historically, disability was associated with a medical tragedy, involving suffering and social personal disadvantage. Such an ontology was embedded in an individual medicalized model of disability. However, the counter-argument was that disability is actually centrally structured by social oppression, inequality and exclusion (Oliver, 1990b, Barnes, 1997a, Finkelstein, 2001b, Thomas, 2007a), captured in the social model of disability (Abberley, 1987, Oliver, 1990b, Barnes, 1990, Campbell and Oliver, 1996, Finkelstein, 2001a, Swain et al., 2014). Nevertheless, there ha been many arguments and much recent criticism, debate and controversy of the social model of disability through the philosophical ideologies of disabled feminist, post-structuralist/modernist and many scholars in the sociology of health and illness. This has been responded to in different ways and in different locations of the world, particularly in the US, UK and Scandinavia, resulting in different versions of the social model, which are explored further below.

4.3 What is a Model of Disability?

To appreciate the limitations of the disability models it is necessary to first understand the function of a model. A model is not the real-world, but a human construct used to understand systems, giving an insight into their processes (Ford, 1999, Finkelstein, 2001b) and are used as a first step in the development of complex theories. Finkelstein (2001b: 3) explains the concept of models as being constructed so that an object can be looked at using different ideas, ways and under different conditions (Oliver, 2004a), however, they do not explain anything. For example, model airplanes might be constructed to test behaviour in a wind tunnel. Although, this practise does not explain the laws governing flight, it might provide the insight from which laws of fight are inspired. Therefore, a model enables us to see something from different viewpoints, which are abstract and difficult to understand, by providing a multi-dimensioned replica of reality that can trigger insights and ideas. Similarly, the models of disability provide insight into the nature of society towards disability, but cannot explain everything. In order to explain the controversies concerning limitations of the two main models, they are briefly revisited below.

4.4 The Individual Medicalised model of disability

As mentioned in Chapter Two, the individual medicalised model is also known as the individual or tragedy model because the person is considered responsible for his/her physical or mental impairment causing disability (Heyer, 2007). The ideology limits disability to being a 'medical problem' within the human body of the individual, restricting physical bodily functions (Oliver, 1990a: 2). Suggesting that the core of the ideology is the belief that disabled people are problematic, they are responsible for their impairment causing disability and need to change and adapt to social circumstances (Norwich, 2013, Dunn and Andrews, 2015). Therefore, the individual medicalised model is limited because it suggests that 'disability is something imposed on top of our impairments' (UPIAS, 1976, cited in Finkelstein, 2001c: 1), holding the individual disabled people responsible for their disablement (Oliver, 1984).

4.5 The Social model of disability

The ideology of the social model of disability is based on three principles: It focuses away from the experience of the personal impairment, which is the basis of the individual medicalised model. Instead, it highlights the problems caused by the disabling environments, barriers and cultures within society. Stated by Oliver (1990b: 32) the social model 'does not deny the problem of disability but locates it squarely within society' meaning the definition of disability is an articulation of these two perspectives. Most importantly, it negates individual specific problems in isolation from the totality of disabling environments. For example, unemployment of disabled academics does not only involve intervention of policies within academic workplaces, but also in the social attitudes and behaviours, education and culture. Lastly, the social model does not at all ignore medical,

rehabilitative, educational or employment based individual interventions in disabled people's lives (Oliver, 2004a). It does, however, place emphasis on externally imposed restrictions, because the social model has a clear focus on the economic, environmental and cultural barriers encountered by people who are viewed by others as having some form of impairment, which maybe physical, sensory or intellectual (Oliver, 2004a). Therefore, it is a tool to provide 'insights into the disabling tendencies of modern society in order to generate policies and practices to facilitate their eradication' (Finkelstein, 2001b, Barnes, 2003a: 8, Barnes, 2012b).

The following responds to recent criticisms, debates and controversies of the social model of disability created through political economy and philosophical ideologies of disabled feminist, post-structuralist/modernist and many scholars in the sociology of health and illness, which are explored further in the following sections.

4.6 Capitalism and the Social Model of Disability

The theoretical position of the social model of disability is based upon Marxist political economy and a historical materialist theory (Oliver, 2004b). It is argued that a capitalist mode of production, where value depends on contribution towards material profit, gives rise to social, economic and political oppression and devalues disabled people in society (Thomas, 2007a).

Initially commodity production demanded that people need to sell their labour-power in society, in order to get access to means of production and to harness themselves in service of a fast moving and exhausting industrial labour process. Those who were disadvantaged and disabled were unable to sell their labour-power and faced exclusion from independently obtaining their means of subsistence, receiving discrimination from society (Oliver, 2004b). Such a perception effectively excludes disabled people from being in paid employment, because disabled people were unable to maintain their employment in the factory system (Roulstone, 2002). Consequently, it separates and excludes them from mainstream social and economic activities (Oliver, 1990a). Market forces therefore, in this view, result in the direct socioeconomic exclusion of disabled people in society (Ryan, 1987, Oliver, 1990b, Finkelstein, 1996, Davis, 1990, Gleeson, 1997). Furthermore, economic exclusion has a profound social effect upon how disability is perceived, experienced and structured. Disability within a capitalist society is therefore defined by the consent and agreement of structural features of culturally, materially, politically, economically and socially produced hegemony and ideology. For this purpose, Oliver (1990b) adopted a Gramscian notion of hegemony to explain this political, social and economic exclusion, suggesting that material and ideological factors produce a controlled (discriminatory disability) capitalist domination via control and consent.

Oliver (1990b) developed a profoundly revolutionary strategy, which stated that the political, economic and social structures of society that had become the dominant ideological hegemony,

resulting in controlling disabled people and making them consent as politically, economically and socially dependent. However, it is possible for societies to be politically, economically and socially transformed towards making disabled people independent where they can live as proper and free citizens. This can be achieved through the reworking and modification of the welfare state, by re-establishing a non-disabled/socialist ideological counter-hegemony, instead of continuing to control and adhere to the dominant ideological hegemony of capitalism, where hegemony of political, economic and social dependency of disabled people remains.

To create this non-disablist/socialist society, firstly it was suggested that states should enact anti-discrimination legislation, giving rise to policies and practises, thereby making it an offence to discriminate against disabled people, especially in areas of education and employment. Secondly, the state must offer freedom of information for disabled people to access information that previously remained confidential. Lastly, the state should establish an infrastructure where disabled people's needs and aspirations are considered, giving rise to provision of appropriate services. Such an non-disabled/socialist ideological counter-hegemony is only possible when collectively the choices people in society make for themselves determine the structure and ideology of society (Roulstone, 2002: 631). For example, in this view, the EqA legislation of the United Kingdom should protect disabled people from discrimination.

Finkelstein (1980) argued that, although early capitalism and its immediate aftermath caused intense ableism, the liberation of disabled people from social oppression, which 'would only obtain when enabling attitudes were in kilter with wider technological developments. This alignment would allow a transcending of the disabling workplace' (Roulstone, 1998: 631). Furthermore, it is argued, due to the increasing pace of technological innovation for disabled people, which is changing the society from an economy based on manufacturing to contemporary supply of information (Hall et al., 1992), the economic and market bias against disabled people will disappear (Finkelstein, 1980, Armer, 2004).

This is because it is potentially more cost-efficient to provide a home computer/laptop and telephone/mobile line than expensive inner-city office space (Handy, 2012), which can also assist in negating effects of many physical or sensory impairments causing disability at the workplace. Also, the increasing development of technological power-tools and aids, has progressively reduced the physical demands of much economic activity. Increasingly, disabled people are able to compete almost equally in the labour market along with non-disabled people, due to the provision of sufficient assistance and physical aids, especially when required by legislation as reasonable adjustments. 'Hence, rather than being viewed as a drain on national economies, welfare systems in

whatever form they take should be viewed as an indicator of collective social responsibility and social justice' (Barnes, 2012a: 481).

However, despite these optimistic predictions, it is argued that disability is still seen as not contributing to profit and legislation requiring the implementation of reasonable adjustments is frequently misunderstood by employers and managers who consider that it may even drain profit if adjustments are costly and not effective (Foster, 2007). The following sections consider further critiques of models of disability that have led to a fracturing of a binary distinction between an individual medicalised model and the collective social model.

4.7 The Critique of Binary Models of Disability

As stated above, the social model of disability does not constitute or consider a social theory, nor does it provide a definition of disability inscribed in a sociological perspective informed by historical materialism (Priestley, 1998, Barnes et al., 1999, Barnes and Mercer, 2004b, Barnes, 2012b). Furthermore, it cannot explain all the aspects of disability, because models only help understand the world better or those bits of it under scrutiny (Finkelstein, 2001c). Although the social model has been an extremely successful political tool and is argued to be a sufficient definition for disability (Finkelstein, 2001a, Barnes, 2012b, Oliver, 2013), many disabled academics suggest that its uses need to be expanded in order to create more enabling platforms, and improve its explanatory power (Corker and French, 1999, Shakespeare and Watson, 2004).

For this purpose, many challenges, debates and controversies have developed through the removal of 'traditional association with matters biomedical and placed it on a new social terrain' (Thomas, 2007b: 7). The postmodernist and poststructuralist theorists and academics within disability studies, reject traditional parameters in the theorisation of disability and instead have a deconstructionist perspective towards dismantling disability (Thomas, 2004b) by interrogating social categories like culture, discourses, language and practices towards disability and dichotomies like impaired/non-impaired and normal/abnormal. They have focussed on impairment and disability separately, suggesting that there are pre-social biological differences, separating impaired from the normal (Price and Shildrick, 1998, Corker and French, 1999, Corker and Shakespeare, 2002). Consequently, these critiques return to an ideology that identifies disabled people as socially impaired, who are excluded and disadvantaged in society and those who are non-impaired as normal, included and privileged.

The social model has taken different directions with the US, UK and Scandinavian counties (Thomas, 2007a). Thomas (2007a:7-8) argues that the distinction between medical and social models is less distinct in US and Scandinavian approaches than it is in the UK. In the US, the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was strongly influenced by the rights of military veterans and the civil rights

movement. Prior to the ADA disability was understood as a conventional functionalist/deviance analysis and rehabilitation based on a 'radical consumerism' and 'independent-living' having equal ideology and culture (DeJong, 1979: 1). Such ideologies rested on the relationship between impairment and non-disabled (normal) (Davis, 1995), concentrating on discourse and construction of the individual body (Thomas, 2007b) arguing that physical health, mental balance and moral soundness are linked, in order to associate defective bodies and minds (Shakespeare, 1994b, Garland-Thomson, 2006, Thomson, 2017).

Gustavsson (2004) argues that there is no clear linguistic separation of disability and impairment in the Scandinavian languages with the result that there is a conceptual blurring of the boundaries between social and medical models. Consequentially, it is argued that the Scandinavian social model allows the examination of disabled people's discrimination and oppression against a particular impairment (Gustavsson, 2004, Kristiansen and Traustadóttir, 2004, Europe, 2008) whilst simultaneously acknowledging the social model assists in gaining insights into social oppression and/or discrimination regarding the impairment under scrutiny (Tøssebro and Kittelsaa, 2004, Söder, 2009).

Similarly, many disabled feminist argue that impairment related experiences must be included in disability theorising (Morris, 1991b, Crow, 1996), because just removing social barriers is not the solution encountered by all disabled people. The complexity and severity of particular conditions (impairment) needs investigation (French, 1993, Thomas, 1999). Also, from the 1980s the arrival of anti-foundationalist epistemologies in the social sciences and humanities in the academy suggested that various equality characteristics like gender, race, ethnicity, sexuality, age, class, etc. influence social diversity and differences (Skeggs, 1995, Lury, 1995). Therefore, the more complex and fragmented nature of gender relations needs to be attuned to multiple differences to allow social relationships that constitute disability to articulate with those that constitute gender (Thomas, 2007b). For example, disabled women and disabled men are differently understood through interactions, social spaces and theory of their social positioning and 'disabled women are doubly oppressed because patriarchy operates in conjunction with disablism' (Morris, 1993b) cited in (Thomas, 2004a: 35).

It could be argued that critiques of the social model of disability revert in some ways to earlier approaches in the sociology of health and illness, which investigated disability through a conventional functionalist approach, i.e. not being normal/deviance and individualism (Anderson and Bury, 1988, Bury, 1991). Focusing almost entirely on the failing of the body where having impairments suggests personal as well as medical impairment, disregarding the significance of socially inclusive barriers (Scambler, 2004: 29), which fails to address many theoretical questions of

sociology. Thus, indirectly concentrating on the individual medicalised model of disability decreases and undermines the UK based social model's significance in society (Oliver, 2004a). According to Barton et al. (2002) 'It is perhaps testament to the inward looking practices of many medical sociologists, and academia generally' (Barnes, 2012b: 13) that the social model still has currency.

Approaches that shift focus away from disability created through economic forces, toward a gradual political focus on culture, language and discourse, instead of focusing on the economic and social relations within society (Oliver and Barnes, 1998, Sheldon, 2006, Barnes, 2012b) over-complicate disability politics and disadvantage disabled people and activists. Furthermore, such proclamations of post-structuralist/modernist and sociologists of disability would only be of interest towards philosophical social theory, because there is no practical meaningful advice or value in terms of research, policy and practice (Oliver, 2004a). Similarly, medical and non-medical sociologists (Bury, 1996, 2000; Williams, 2003), only re-enforce societal oppression within policy, as it is stated by (Bickenbach, 2008: 110) 'changing the person, rather than changing the world'.

Despite the social model's critics within the disabled people's movement and from external positions, it is considered as a valuable tool in defining disabled people's social oppression. It aims to deconstruct and counter disablement in society, through the direct experience and understanding of disability. This includes issues of marginalisation and oppression produced by hegemonic social and cultural institutions (Oliver, 1990b). In short, it remains a powerful tool used to provide insights into the disabling tendencies of society to generate policies and practices to facilitate eradication of discrimination (Barnes, 2012b 12).

Due to continued global economic fluctuation, a materialistic perspective is particularly relevant when it is increasingly clear that the development of capitalism has escalated inequality within societies (Durvasula and Lysonski, 2010). Such circumstances are due to unregulated industrial development, causing an unsustainable food supply for the expanding global population (Harvey, 2010). Hence, economic and political stability of societies become fragile, making it difficult for societies to be fair and inclusive (Barnes and Sheldon, 2010) particularly when the political response to global financial crises is austerity in public spending. However, using a theoretical and practical framework informed by the social model, insights can address and explore such concerns and struggles towards a fairer and just society (Oliver, 2004a).

So far this Chapter has concentrated on exploring a range of positions in understanding disability, highlighting social structures, practices and stereotypical ideas that exclude, marginalise and/or disadvantage disabled people in society (Oliver, 1996a). The main focus of this thesis is the

workplace. Therefore, hopefully, it is clear that disabling practices and ableist assumptions are embedded in practices and procedures of the workplace (as well as society), hindering the social inclusion of disabled people (Foster and Wass, 2013) and that social models still provide the most concrete potential to remove disability discrimination through workplace equality practices. This is the conceptualization of the social model of disability used in this thesis.

4.8 Reflections of the Models of Disability within the EqA and the workplace practices

Chapter One discussed the three main limitations of the EqA, causing weaknesses within the legislation. The first is the restrictive statutory definition of disability (Geffen, 2013), which is in section 6 of the EqA, suggesting that in order to be considered disabled, the requirements must include that the impairment should be long-term. Therefore, focusing on the individualised medical model, where an employee having an impairment is only considered disabled within their workplace, if their impairment lasts for minimum twelve months, particularly in the context of its applicability. This becomes complicated when identifying who is a disabled employee and who is not, especially in the case of severe depression and other mental health disabilities.

According to Lawson (2011: 1), application of reasonable adjustments is a valuable encouraging resource for disabled people, because it is 'not a form of compensation or subsidy, but a tool for requiring employers and others to remove particular disadvantages, which their provisions, criteria, practices and premises would otherwise cause to the particular disabled person', provoking change within employment practices and creating disability equality within the workplace. However, it could be argued that the legal concept of 'reasonableness' is a device to protect employers from frivolous and undeserving claims of disability and reinforces the idea that a certain level of disadvantage should be tolerated. The second limitation, therefore, suggests that the EqA requires more proactivity, rather than simply having a reactive, partial approach towards implementation of reasonable adjustments. This is because as stated in section 20, schedule 8 of the EqA, the duty to install reasonable adjustments at the workplace only applies if the employer knows, or ought to know about the particular disabled employee and/or is exposed to the relevant substantial disadvantage towards the employee with the impairment. This places the onus of initiating reasonable adjustments on the employee. For example, consideration of flexible working hours are considered only if the disabled employee requests them with valid reasoning. Instead, the employer could be proactive and ask about these workplace adjustments before the disabled employee starts working or, better still, view flexible working as something that could benefit all employees. Therefore, once again, the EqA directs itself towards the individualised medical model, suggesting the duty is to respond to the disadvantage experienced by a particular individual, taking account of the particular disability circumstance of a specific person.

The third limitation of the EqA is the implementation of none or inappropriate reasonable adjustments, due to lack of knowledge about the legislation by the employers and/or the line-managers, like complaining about the high cost of reasonable adjustments, which will cause financial damage to the business. Such an approach demonstrates an individualised medicalised model understanding and also within the workplace practises, by prioritising ablesim and not considering the fixing of barriers towards the disabled employee (Foster and Wass, 2013). Although, most reasonable adjustments are free or relatively cheap to make, if the employer is worried about expenses, this is most probably due to not being clear about or proper awareness of the EqA, because Access to Work, an organization designed by the government assists with reasonable adjustments (Directgov, 2013).

Although, Section 20 and 21 makes it clear that a failure to comply with the inability to remove a substantial disadvantage regarding disabled person/employees, would constitute unlawful discrimination (EHRC, 2010a), which could be punishable or penalised in the form of a heavy fines by law (Lords, 2016). However, the EqA is still, in part, based on the individual medicalised model of disability (Fraser Butlin, 2011, Koyithara, 2018), for example, implementation of reasonable adjustments depends on how 'reasonable' adjustments are perceived by the non-disabled employer of the workplace. Therefore, suggesting that only a small part of the EqA enforces disabled people's equal participation in the workplace and the implementation of reasonable adjustments, constituting a small portion of the social model approach towards disability. Furthermore, it can be said that the notion of the EqA encourages a social view of disability practises within the workplace which are misleading (Koyithara, 2018) and its potential contribution remain constrained by restrictive interpretations of the legislation (Owens, 2015). This vacillation of the EqA towards the individualised medical and sometimes towards the social model is further considered in the last research question, which is discussed in the conclusions (Chapter Twelve), with respect to the findings of this thesis.

To examine the potential role of equality theories in relation to disability, a critical analysis of the liberal and radical approaches to equality are considered in the following section.

4.9 The Critical Analysis of the Liberal and Radical approaches to Equality

Achievement of equality within the workplace is often reduced to two principal concepts, which are the liberal and radical equality approaches. Both of these equality approaches have their own different styles, based on their implementation techniques (Burchardt and Vizard, 2007). Liberal approaches to equality, also known as equal opportunities or formal equality within legal literature, suggests that barriers inhibiting social progress of particular groups should be removed, so that employment begins on an equal 'level playing-field'. For example, a workplace considering equal-

opportunity allows employees to compete freely and equally for the same social rewards, like jobs, promotions, bonuses, training-opportunities, etc. assuming that all employees are facilitated to enable free and equal access to compete with each other (Webb, 1997). Thus, standardized policies and procedures are required at the workplace, having no subjective biases available to every employee. Simultaneously, employees are encouraged to compete, as long as the decision-making process is uncontaminated by personal influence.

However, the liberal approach may demonstrate difficulty in embracing the structural sources that create inequality of social capacities and skills among employees (Jewson and Mason, 1986). For example, the UK legislation broke the mould by introducing the concept of 'reasonable adjustments', a legal necessity given to disabled employees, to participate on equal terms with able-bodied employees. However, this often incurs a criticism from employers and some employees, suggesting that disabled employees are getting preferential treatment. Therefore, employers and managers are often guilty of ignoring the proper implementation of policies and procedures (Foster and Fosh, 2010). The 1944 Disabled Persons Employment Act, an obligation on employers to engage a quota of disabled employees, prompted an accusation that disabled people were being appointed because of their disability, rather than on merit (Coussey and Jackson, 1991). This is part of an on-going argument that positive action such as quotas result in preferential-treatment (discrimination) on the basis of personal characteristics.

On the other hand, a radical approach to equality, also known as equality of outcome, or substantive equality within legal literature, suggests that to acquire equality, social inequalities need to be further challenged through intervention of appropriate social practices. For example, a radical perspective would argue that just implementing reasonable adjustments at the workplace is not sufficient and substantive equality means ensuring they lead to positive change and should include measures like targets, monitoring and quotas. At the centre of the radical approach is the recognition that structural inequalities and disadvantages cannot be overcome by only introducing unbiased policies and procedures, which may further reproduce inequalities among employees. Therefore, a radical approach requires placing emphasis on the delivery of rewards instead of the fairness of policies and procedures (Jewson and Mason, 1986: 315).

The liberal approach to equality is critiqued by suggesting that minorities and underprivileged employees are not obviously represented and reward is not fairly distributed, suggesting that indirect discrimination will occur, despite incorporating fair and equal policies (Deslippe, 2012). This is the reason a radical approach, like the social model, considers disability not to be a neutral term, instead it sees social disadvantage as needing rectification through appropriate intervention (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977).

Commonly, most workplaces recognize and operate more closely to a liberal model of equal opportunity (Cockburn, 1991, Krook, 2016), expressing a commitment to a redistributive resolution by establishing, championing and implementing liberal policies and procedures (Bruegel and Kean, 1995, Johnson, 2018). These orthodox equality policies are often criticised by the radical equality approach as masking managerial commitment, resulting in weak remedial solutions (Watson, 1993, Reed, 2018).

When considering equality for disabled academics together with the two models of disability, it might be argued that the university workplace adopts a largely liberal approach to disability, ignoring any structural sources of inequality that inhibit the status of the disabled academic (Thompson, 2016). To further understand disability in the academic workplace, Gramscian theories are used to counter the gaps created by the models of disability and equality because, it is argued, they offer different ways of understanding oppression and counter-management of such circumstances caused by hegemonic barriers, for example who and what kind of knowledge should be responsible for changing attitudes and behaviours within the workplace.

4.10 Adding Gramscian theories to a Theoretical and Conceptual framework of Disability

The theoretical and conceptual framework of this thesis has, so far, been developed by using the individualised medical and social models of disability coupled with the liberal and radical approaches to equality as they relate to disability. One of the main and crucial contributions of this thesis is to examine these contemporary theories associated with disability, under the light of a Gramscian theoretical framework. Such an analysis assists in understanding the tensions between the individualised medical and social models of disability in the context of employment and more specifically, on the experience of disabled academics working in English universities. This critical framework is developed, because it recognizes complex and relational, tangible and intangible barriers of disabled academics. The addition of a Gramscian theoretical framework assists in overcoming the gaps created by the models of disability and the liberal and radical equality approaches by making visible the development of ideologies, the unhidden/hidden hegemonic power within the University workplace and the ability of disabled academics to resist.

Other theoretical frameworks could be applied to this study, such as post-structuralism or post-modernism. However, it would be difficult to avoid problematic issues of power between structure and agency, which cannot be adequately seen in the accounts of the above theories. For example, in post-structuralist theory the body is considered to have no social meaning, it is like a passive vessel, authorising and imposing power discourses (Paterson and Hughes, 1999). Contrarily, post-modernism is considered as any judgment regarding validity on the basis of discourse producing the

most convincing argument (Kvale, 1995). Although, these theories may be able to explain the exercise of power, they inadequately explain the mechanisms behind the maintenance of structural power and agency.

Antonio Gramsci, acknowledged ideological interests based on a theoretical concept of hegemonic power. From a Gramscian perspective, the dependence on social and institutional structures is the principal cause of oppression. The role of power maintains the hegemonic actions being exercised by the dominant subject, to support society's material interests, suggesting structure and agency are sources of hegemonic power (Jessop, 2007).

Some disability scholars use Gramscian theories to illustrate the history of oppression on disabled people, due to dominance of medicine and medical doctors (Oliver and Zarb, 1989, Shakespeare, 1996, Barnes, 1999, Coogan, 2014, Holler, 2017, Goodley, 2017). For example, translating disability as common-sense, i.e. everyday assumptions and beliefs (Gramsci, 1971c) that it is a 'personal-tragedy', which it is argued has achieved a status of 'ideological hegemony' in society (Barton and Oliver, 1997). Additionally, the DPM, developing the social model during the 1970s, are considered to be organic-intellectuals (Shakespeare, 1998). Many disability scholars applied separately individual concepts from Gramscian theories. However, a critical framework designed by combining multiple Gramscian theories are used in this thesis. This assists the investigation of the dominant ideological understandings of disability and then challenges them. Hence, the analysis adopts a historical and contemporary perspective of disabled people, which is influential in removing disabling societal barriers.

4.11 Gramscian Theory

Gramsci was an Italian Marxist theorist and politician in the 20th Century when class interests in society were more clearly distinct. Gramsci examined and theorised how the state and ruling capitalist class (bourgeois) used politics and cultural institutions to maintain power over the working-class (proletariat) in capitalist societies. According to Gramsci, the bourgeois develops a hegemonic culture using ideology and violence, economic-force and coercion. The purpose of a hegemonic culture is to slowly and gradually breed, developing its own values and norms, while maintaining the *status quo*. Therefore, hegemonic power maintains consent to the capitalist order as a more sophisticated option but uses coercive power to maintain order. Hegemony, therefore, produces and reproduces the dominant class forming the superstructure, i.e. the political power structures, which underpins the power of employer over the employee within the workplace (Haralambos and Holborn, 2013).

Gramsci did not live long enough after his imprisonment to interpret his famous Prison Notebooks into a comprehensive theory of class struggle in the Italian society (Sassoon, 1982). Although, his

work has been interpreted by many scholars, unfortunately, this process has been inconsistent and lacking accuracy. It is argued that Gramsci's work needs to be understood according to the real context of the political problem of that time (Harris, 1992). For example, Verdicchio (1995: 175) stated 'Gramsci needs to be read and studied, first and foremost, as a representative of the condition from which he was educated into Italianness. It is in such a re-reading that Gramsci can best lead us to a new-way of being Gramscian'. Therefore, although it would be difficult to apply the whole of Gramscian theory to this thesis, the essence of his ideas can be loosely and equivocally applied in understanding the institutional barriers faced by disabled academics and their resistance. In particular, the concepts of ideology, hegemony, good and common-sense, and the role of intellectuals will be applied to analysing equality for disabled academic employees in universities in England.

4.12 Ideology

According to Gramsci, ideology is a concept containing particular practices, principles and doctrines, which are material and institutional in nature (Freeden, 2003). Therefore, ideology is not just a system of ideas arising from a single aspect, instead it is a system of societal beliefs and practices encompassing society's complete functioning, influencing personal acts and moral behaviours.

Ideology crucially underpins discrimination and social prejudice against the disadvantaged. As the historical analysis in Chapter Two shows that a dominant ableist ideological assumption of disabled people is that they are unable to meet the physical requirement necessary to adapt to employment and should be excluded (Rose, 1975, Oliver, 1990b, Oliver et al., 2012). For example, historically the dominant ideology of disability was rooted in the individual medicalised model, focussing on institutionalisation and medical interventions for disabled people (Oliver, 1990a). The Gramscian theory of ideology, therefore, assist in understanding, as well as identifying the contradictory practises being used towards disabled employees and their employment.

4.13 Hegemony

The acceptance of fascism by the proletariat led Gramsci to develop the theory on hegemony (Daldal, 2014). Hegemony refers to the dominant class exercising and maintaining its position through mixing forces, i.e. enforcing laws. For example, in 1587 the Poor Law instigated an individual medicalised model view of disability as the beginnings of the hegemonic ideology (Sullivan, 1991). Hegemonic ideologies are enforced by political coercion, economic and cultural power in society, over other, less powerful, social groups (Laclau and Mouffe, 2001). Hegemony is pursued through 'extremely complex mediums, diverse institutions and constantly changing processes' (Buttigieg, 1995: 7). Hence, hegemony is 'the ideological predominance of bourgeois values and norms over the proletariat who accept them as normal' (Carnoy, 1986: 66). This process is called predominance of

consent in which the majority of society are governed under the hegemonic dominant class (Strinati, 2004). They exercise a political, intellectual and moral role of leadership within society, based on a common ideology (Ramos, 1982).

From a Gramscian perspective, it is possible to refute and oppose hegemony established by the dominant class. This can be achieved once a new hegemonic ideology is developed by another social group in favour of the proletariat, contradictory to the hegemonic ideology of the bourgeois. This process is called counter-hegemony, breaking the previous ideology created by the bourgeois hegemonic dominant class. Gramsci's proposition is that the less powerful social groups need to convince the proletariat of their counter-ideological stance, refraining from direct physical force, like armed uprising, general-strike, etc. against the dominant hegemonic class of the bourgeois because it will not threaten them as their credibility and authority is firmly rooted in the civil society. They should 'Instead concentrate on the difficult and immensely complicated tasks that a war-of-position within civil-society entails' (Buttigieg, 2005: 41). This is because, for Gramsci, cultural domination is more sensitive to a war-of-position, rather than physical might, as its foundation (Gramsci, 2007: 168).

Thus, transforming previous hegemonic ideology and redefining hegemonic structures and systems is achieved through re-articulation of ideology into a new hegemonic ideology through the efforts and struggle of the aspiring hegemonic class and the proletariat's collective-will (Sassoon, 1982). This 'war-of-Position' begins historically and is basically a struggle for the proletariat's better living and working conditions (Mouffe, 2014). Hegemony becomes a product of the interchange between social groups based on economic, social, political and cultural values aimed towards the promotion of interests of that social group (Cammett, 1967). For example, the disabled activists became economically, socially, politically and culturally conscious, giving rise to a new hegemony that culminated in the development of the social model (Oliver, 1996b). This process is very slow and gradually builds up by the strengthening of social foundations of a new hegemony, creating alternative institutions in an existing society (Cox, 1983). From a Gramscian perspective, 'it shapes how people see their world and how they manoeuvre within it and, more importantly, how it shapes their ability to imagine how it might be changed, whether they see such changes as feasible or desirable' (Crehan, 2002: 71).

When applied to disability, Gramscian theories of hegemony and ideology demonstrate how the social model has managed to accomplish a certain level of counter-hegemonic status in fostering new ideological understandings. For example, the Joseph Rowntree Foundation only accepts research on disability based on the social model (Burchardt, 2000).

Once the war-of-position is won, the counter-hegemonic ideology needs to maintain and continue a social ideology within the historical, economic, political and cultural aspects of society. Hegemony is never complete but is always challenged by opposing forces because of the continuous rise and fall of oppositional forces within society (Gramsci, 1971c, Ramos, 1982). For example, many scholars from a post-materialist and post-structuralist perspective oppose the social model because they refuse to recognize the exercising of power with time (Hughes and Paterson, 1997, Gabel and Peters, 2004, Shakespeare and Watson, 2001, Tremain, 2005).

The concept of hegemony, in this thesis, will assist in identifying the perceived sources of oppression towards and resistance of disabled academic employees, particularly during the development of the social model when necessary conventions were established for the subversion of hegemony created by the individual medicalised model. The complexities of gaining a new hegemonic ideology, obtaining social change and developing a strong and dynamic culture within the workplace for disabled academics is an important issue that is materialized within this thesis. The use of predominance of consent, counter-hegemony and war-of-position are used in the analysis of the three University case-studies as are the concepts of good-sense and common-sense explained below.

4.14 Common-sense and good-sense

Common-sense and good-sense are both historically and socially situated, facilitating various social functions in society (Coben, 2005). According to (Gramsci, 1971a: 326) ‘Every social-stratum has its own common-sense and good-sense, which are basically the most widespread conception of life and of man’. These concepts are also useful for this thesis, because they identify functions and the coexistence of various ideologies in society regarding disability. For example, historically common-sense ideology was that disabled people should be segregated, institutionalised and prevented from engaging fully in social activities. Whereas, good-sense suggests that discriminatory social attitudes and environments disables disabled people (Oliver, 1990b).

Common-sense depicts everyday thinking, proposing a framework to make sense of the world. It is easily available knowledge, containing no complicated ideas, needs no sophisticated argument and does not depend on intense thinking or reading (Simon, 1982). Hall and O'Shea (2013: 9) suggested that, ‘it works intuitively, without forethought or reflection’, it is like folklore and exists in many forms. One common-sense will be contradictory to the others as it is based on being pragmatic and empirical, arising directly from experience, reflecting only the realities of daily-life and answering the needs of common people for practical guidance and advice.

‘It is the incoherent set of generally held assumptions and common-belief to any society’ (Gramsci, 1971c: 323). When applied to disability it is used to describe the hegemonic ideology of the

individual medicalised model and medicalization of disability by 'the myths of disability through books, articles, lectures and other forms of soothsaying and oracle' (Brisenden, 1986a: 173). Common-sense is accepted by society's majority and there is no denying it even if the assumptions are incorrect. This is because, as mentioned earlier, common-sense is not a function of reason; rather it originates from the diffused collective beliefs and a shared hegemonic ideology.

According to Gramsci (1971a: 328) common-sense 'contains a healthy nucleus of good-sense', which 'deserves to be made more unitary and coherent'. Thus, good-sense maybe created out of the critique of common-sense, involving 'renovating and making critical an already existing activity' (Gramsci, 1971a: 331, Coben, 2005). For example, the social model, as good-sense, was developed from the common-sense of the individual medicalised model not reflecting the reality of disability. The good-sense understanding of disability was uncritically taken from the medical profession in the past, becoming the common-sense acceptance in society (Oliver, 1990a). It is the production of inefficient ideas and thoughts in an episodic and haphazard way, instead of being coherent, logical and critical to avoid-conformism (Daldal, 2014). Consequently, good-sense begins by critiquing the hegemonic ideology and practices that are rooted in common-sense understandings, illustrating the moral and ethical status of good-sense over the uncritical ideologies and beliefs of common-sense.

Gramsci believed that good-sense eventually turns into common-sense. This happens with the progression of time as good-sense tends to degenerate with time and is unquestioningly accepted by society (Crehan, 2002). For example, with time the entire concept of the social model degenerated into a sterile prescription for implementing reasonable adjustments, instead of providing in-sights into experiences of disabled employees (Finkelstein, 1996). Furthermore, the theories of common and good-sense can be identified within the literature, starting with the position that disability was historically considered as demonic possessions a personal medical tragedy or a result of discrimination and disabling-environments following the development of the social model (Finkelstein, 2001b). The next section explains the role of individuals who develop, promote and encourage these common/good-sense theories.

4.15 Intellectuals

Notwithstanding the sexist-language of the time, (Gottlieb, 1989: 115) stated 'all men are intellectuals, but not all men have in society the function of the intellectuals' suggesting that only intellectuals are capable of explaining ideas, serving old or the new societal classes. They belong to the levels of superstructures i.e. the social, economic and political structures of power. Hence, they are responsible for creating, maintaining and expanding the particular class hegemony in society. This maybe the dominant hegemonic class of the bourgeois or the social class supporting the proletariat (Gramsci, 2009). Gramsci distinguished between traditional and organic-intellectuals. The

traditional intellectuals are linked to past tradition, based on common-sense and have linkage with the dominant economic or political structure of their society. Whereas, organic-intellectuals develop their own ideology, based on good-sense, also directly linking with the common masses of economic and political structures of their society (Cammett, 1967). In short, traditional-intellectuals promote existing ideologies and practices that are common-sense and organic-intellectuals challenge those hegemonic ideologies, forming good-sense.

Thus, traditional-intellectuals either maintain the existing ideology of the dominant group, reinforcing hegemony or are threatened by competition with the organic-intellectuals who have expressed a new ideology, based on good-sense to challenge the dominant ideologies based on common-sense. When applied to models of disability, the traditional-intellectuals propounded the individual medicalised model of disability as a personal medical tragedy. However, the social model can be considered to counter it with a new ideology by the organic-intellectuals.

4.16 Gramsci, Historical Materialism and Social Model of Disability

The Gramscian theoretical framework, which is adopted in this thesis, is based on historical materialism (Thomas, 2006). As noted in Chapter 2, contemporary disability discrimination is firmly rooted in the historical treatment of disabled people but is also located in an economic system that values human lives only in terms of maximum productivity. Here, capitalism is discussed from a Gramscian theoretical framework perspective where the term hegemony is used to capture an analysis of how the ruling capitalist class, i.e. the dominant traditional-intellectuals establish and maintain their control not just through violence, political and economic coercion, but also through ideology, which maintains and fractures relations of the economic base (Ramos, 1982). In short, hegemonic-power can only be attained when cultural-hegemony is also achieved (Gramsci, 1971b, Chandra, 2016). However, a counter-hegemony towards capitalism can also be successfully created, if the necessary steps are taken to overthrow the traditional-hegemonic structures by the good-sense based hegemony, which is developed by organic-intellectuals and their allies (Mastroianni, 2002).

In applying Gramscian theory in this thesis, it is argued that traditional-intellectuals use conventional methods of doing disability research, where non-disabled researchers create knowledge based on traditional hegemonic common-sense focusing on the individual medicalised model (Oliver, 1992, Zarb, 1995). However, in a counter-hegemonic move, disabled organic-intellectuals have challenged hegemonic approaches using their organic good-sense based on their experiences of disability captured in the social model. Therefore, a social model based emancipatory research process changes the social and material relations of research production controlled by disabled people themselves (Oliver, 1992).

An emancipatory approach towards disability research is also adopted for this thesis, discussed further in Chapter Five where it is argued that using such a framework is the best way of doing this research, in the context of mature capitalism where individual medicalised and social models compete for hegemony which, as described above, is clearly visible in the EqA.

In this thesis the research highlights how disabled academics as organic-intellectuals have critically examined the common-sense, challenging the traditional-intellectuals' produced knowledge, which does not reveal the true lives of disabled academics in universities. Some of the organic-intellectuals who took part in this research have managed to challenge and improve the knowledge quality by developing an organic culture based on good-sense and the social model of disability in order to counter traditional-intellectuals' ideology, which represents the individualised medical model as natural or normal cultural values within the University. This is also acknowledged in the auto-ethnography (Chapter Seven) and the three case-studies of the empirical chapters (Chapter Eight, Nine and Ten).

Gramscian theories along with the concepts of the social and individual medicalised model and the liberal and radical equality approaches are used to explore this thesis, using the following research question:

1. Why and how does the history of attitudes towards disability influence employment of disabled academics?
2. How is disability hegemonized within equality policies and practices in the workplace?
3. Is emancipatory disability research part of being a disabled organic-intellectual?
4. How do the models of disability influence the policies and practises of universities for disabled academics' employment?
5. Are disabled academics organic-intellectuals? If so, how is this manifested?
6. How do some parts of the legislation, create the individual medicalised model as hegemony, whereas, other parts encourage disabled organic-intellectuals to challenge the hegemony?

A large portion of the first, second and third research questions have been answered in Chapters Two, Three and Five. The answers to the rest of the research questions are developed through the auto-ethnography, empirical and discussion chapters, that explore whether the disabled academic employees found theory and practice to be unproblematic, or incommensurate with each other. These are contained within the following conclusion Chapter Twelve.

4.17 Conclusions

This Chapter has outlined the theoretical and conceptual framework of this thesis, highlighting the transition and linkages between concepts of the popular individual medicalised and social models of

disability, liberal and radical equality approaches and using them to develop Gramscian theories of disability. The framework enables a complex exploration of social/anti-social, relational and personal/impersonal situations of disabled academic employees, identifying ideologies associated with social hegemony towards disability. The framework will be used to reveal the impact of individual medicalised and social models on policies and practises implemented using the liberal and radical equality approaches and to identify the position of disabled academics in the university workplace, accordingly. Furthermore, it identifies research question that have been constructed through the understanding of the Gramsian theories along with the concepts of the social and individual medicalised model and the liberal and radical equality approaches, which are being used in the exploration of this thesis. The next Chapter turns towards explaining the importance of disability research and disabled academics.

5.0 Chapter Five: Importance of Researching Disability

5.1 Introduction

The previous Chapter focuses on discussing the theoretical and conceptual framework of this thesis, incorporating the construction and usage of the individual medicalised and social models of disability (Finkelstein, 2007, Oliver, 1990a, Paterson, 2001), the liberal and radical equality approaches (Jewson and Mason, 1986) and interpretation of Gramscian theories providing a broader understanding of disabled academics' employment at the University workplace.

This Chapter includes an analysis of the literature relating to the emergence of disability research within social science and particularly the influence of feminist on research, proposing an essential social-inquiry that is required in planning services and listing priorities to enhance the lives of disabled people (Turmusani, 2004). The analysis provides a background context of research in social sciences, including the early traditional and emergence of contemporary approaches towards research. This is applied to disability research, including various approaches and features to understand the necessity of disability research.

The methods of doing disability research are reviewed, demonstrating the contribution of the feminist theories in the development of a practical and technical approach towards researching disability. The resulting emancipatory research method is argued to create validity of producing good disability research. The Chapter concludes by providing an overview of knowledge creation through research managed and controlled by disabled academics. It is argued that research conducted and knowledge produced by non-disabled academics might be misunderstood and misrepresentative, providing incorrect information about disability. Therefore, it is further argued that disabled academics are necessary for producing good quality disability research.

5.2 Why have Research on Disability?

> Research is absolutely vital because the more research that is done the better the argumentation that can be made (Kitchin, 2000a: 29).

Before answering the question *why have research on disability*, the contextual importance of disability research must first be understood. As argued in Chapter Two, historically, disabled people were marginalized because of being conceptualised as an individualised medical tragedy (Oliver, 1984). Similarly, the early traditional approaches towards research on disability did not represent experiences and knowledge of disabled peoples. Instead, reinforced by the medical model, disabled people were viewed as powerless objects (Barnes, 1996). However, it was contended that only people who have experienced disability can truly interpret and present disability-knowledge. Before this was the case, research concerning disability was 'invariably researcher orientated, based around

the desires and agendas of the (non-disabled) academics and able-bodied funding agencies rather than subject(s) of the research (disabled people)' (Kitchin, 2002: 1). Thus, whilst research on disability was conducted by non-disabled academics (Stone and Priestley, 1996), the focus of disability research remained focussed on undesirable differences and/or individual limitations or medical rehabilitation, which were limited in informing societal policies and legislation regarding disabled people's emancipation (Barnes, 2014b).

Consequently, Oliver (1992) argued that disability research not led by disabled people represented their alienation, disempowerment and disenfranchisement by taking their knowledge and using it to benefit personal research agendas. Hence, research was largely a source of exploitation, rather than liberation (Barnes and Mercer, 1997b). Disability research was then, and still now, criticised for not contributing 'directly enough in the emancipation of disabled people from oppressive social practices' (Duckett and Pratt, 2001: 815). To further understand this situation, the section below illustrates in detail the significant background context of research within social science (Coghlan and Brannick, 2014), leading to disability research.

5.3 The Dominant Traditional Research Approaches

Traditionally, research was considered to discover new knowledge or to figure out a solution for a problem using quantitative methods, very much associated with experimental methods of science and medicine (Shuttleworth, 2008). This also had an influence on research within the social sciences, giving rise to positivism. It is an orthodox approach towards social science research, attempting to apply methods from the natural sciences into the social sciences, uncovering natural laws. A positivist-paradigm is associated with quantitative methods within research, claiming that the world can be broken into categories and measured; these measurements are then used to explain and predict events. It is considered to be independent of cultural, social, historical values and of any relationship between the participant, research and the researcher. Suggesting, 'the elimination of bias has been successful, the process of data-collection and the nature of the collected-data are seen as relatively unproblematic' (Mottier, 2005: 2). Therefore, using a positivist paradigm for research focuses on objectivity, meaning 'it is independent of the assumptions underpinning it and the methods used to obtain it' (Oliver, 1992: 106).

5.4 Positivist Approach

Although, positivism remained the dominant traditional research approach for a long time within social science research, it inflamed many discussions and question about its nature, focussing on objectivity and reintegration of subjectivity (Cicourel, 1964, Giddens, 1976, Hindess, 1977, Rabinow and Sullivan, 1987). In critique of positivism, it was contended that the world is composed socially, subjects are always active and not passive, suggesting that relationships have meaningful attributes.

Therefore, using a positivistic paradigm would mean conducting research independent of worldly social attributes, creating an irrational and rigid outcome (Oliver, 1992).

5.5 Interpretivist Approach

This argument gave rise to the production of interpretivism, a qualitative paradigm based on 'interpretation and explanation, where objectivity and subjectivity, cannot be clearly separated' within social science research (Mottier, 2005: 3). It acknowledges the world as a social, meaningful place, having active subjects instead of passive objects. It also highlights the meanings of events, their causes and that the research is a product of value produced by the researchers and cannot be independent of them (Bryson, 1979, Heron, 1981, Rowan, 1981, Oliver, 1992). Within an interpretivist research paradigm, the academic is considered to be the expert in their research laying the ground rules, whereas, the participants are considered to be knowledge holders of reality, which is explored through the interpretivist research process (Willis, 2007). In this approach knowledge is socially constructed within a particular historical context (Oliver, 1992).

4.6 The Argument of Positivism and Interpretivism

Interpretivism has always received negative reactions and criticisms from the positivist academics, suggesting that it is unscientific; making it problematic to rationalize and it is highly motivated by history, culture and politics; making it overtly-biased (Du Bois, 1979b, Cook and Fonow, 1984, Gage, 1989). Simultaneously, an interpretive research approach was also criticized by disability researchers, because it supports a 'relatively small group of powerful experts doing work on a larger number of relatively powerless research subjects' (Oliver, 1992: 106, Barnes, 1992b, Bury, 1996). For example, during the 1960s, a classic research work was produced by Robert Edgerton using an interpretivist paradigm investigating institutionalized disabled people's everyday lives (Edgerton and Bercovici, 1976). It contained disabled people's interviews speaking about their own lives, focussing on the role of stigma in their lives and their efforts to pass as normal (Edgerton, 1993). However, later it was discovered that the production of this research involved misinterpretation, suggesting 'Edgerton's theoretical and narrative strategies serve to deny them the authority to analyse their own circumstances' (Gerber, 1990: 6). Although this interpretive research did dive into the cultural, historical and political disability context, it failed to understand the participants, lacking dialogue with those interviewed. The research demonstrated the scope for exploitation where the academic remains in control of the research agenda and the participants seem to be disadvantaged and consequently isolated and alienated due to their relatively powerless situations of being unable to give insight into their real situations.

Both the above mentioned approaches have the potential to maintain destructive elements towards any sensitive social science research. This is because, conducting research based on a positivistic

paradigm, the academic has greater access to the research subject, but only as an object. Whereas, when using an interpretive paradigm, the academic is more subjective and collaborative, but the power of interpretation still belongs to the researcher. Therefore, the defects of both approaches merely reinforce one another, isolating the participants, reflecting a research outcome that benefits the academic's research only (Finch, 1988a, Oliver, 1992, Barnes and Mercer, 1997b, Carr and Kemmis, 2003). Such approaches would subsequently be a threat towards investigating or uncovering sensitive and problematic issues in relation to disability where the participants are less positively placed, whereas the power of interpretation and action remains with the researcher and funder (Shakespeare, 1996).

Feminism has hugely influenced social science research (Harding, 1987), particularly disability research. Its aim is to understand the nature of inequality in society through researching and investigating gendered social roles and lived experiences of the oppressed and underprivileged (Chodorow, 1989). The feminist approach emerged within social science research during the 1970s when there was concern raised about the absence of women's voices in research because women were oppressed and underprivileged (Finch and Groves, 1983, Cook and Fonow, 1984, Finch, 1988b, Lorber, 1994). Within a feminist research paradigm the academic ensures three supporting characteristics which are: collaboration, co-operation and mutual-respect, as necessary outcomes and relevant requirements for all participants (Oakley, 1981, Mies, 1999). Furthermore, it ensures the presence of the previously absent subject and facilitates the voices of the oppressed and underprivileged in terms of their daily lived experiences often achieved through the use of diaries, historical sources, storytelling and/or unstructured-interviews. This would allow a more complete and detailed interpretation of an individual situation, simultaneously empowering the research-participant (Denzin, 1970, Munford, 1989, Munford, 1994, Morris, 1992). Furthermore, it is committed towards altering the personal, political and social environment through co-production with the research participants. Thus, contributing towards understanding the power of the marginalised groups, in order to achieve lasting social change (Fay, 1987).

After discovering the defects and strengths of the positivist, interpretivists and feminist research-paradigms, a combination of all the above-mentioned research-approaches have been put together to form an emancipatory research paradigm (Denzin, 1970, Oliver, 1992). Emancipatory research highlights the struggles of the oppressed social groups and the research participants through their lived experiences using their voices and ensuring that both researcher and researched become changers and changed (Lather, 1988). Finally, drawing on feminist research, the way emancipatory research is conducted builds upon trust, respect, participation, reciprocity and empowerment, which enlightens the struggles of the oppressed research participants, making a change in society (Martin, 2015). An emancipatory research paradigm allows the research to capture a complete, holistic and

contextual portrayal (Coghlan and Brannick, 2014), demonstrating, change and empowerment towards legitimization of knowledge and power.

As highlighted in Chapter One that the last century until the early 1900s the focus of disability research has been concerned with the investigation of the bio-medical impact and eradication of disability (Barnes and Mercer, 1997b). Research was embodied by the eugenicists, which gave rise to inoculation against deadly-diseases such as polio and tuberculosis, causing long-term disabilities, using inhumane techniques like pre-natal diagnosis resulting in sterilization. This was being done to discourage 'the production of the weak of body and intellect' (Williams, 1989: 126, Rioux and Bach, 1994). Consequently, research was being used for investigating the horrifying methods of preventing and eradicating statistics on increasing disability (Radford, 1994, Oliver, 2017).

According to Oliver (1992) disability research was a 'trenchant-attack and a rip-off that has done little, if anything, to confront the social oppression and isolation experienced by disabled people or initiate policies which have made a significant improvement in the quality of their lives' (Barnes and Mercer, 1997a: 1). Rioux and Bach (1994: 14) have further argued 'the wider political-implication of disability were all ignored, leaving disability as a poorly theorized subject in sociology, law and politics.' The next-section turns to detailing the importance of disability research.

5.7 Importance of Disability research

> 'Can (disability) research make a difference in bringing about social change? My answer is: (Yes) it depends on how well it is done' (Sedlacek, 2007: 1).

As mentioned earlier, historically disability research was important towards maintaining disabled people's marginalization. It justified and perpetuated development of policies involving the systematic segregation and the denial of disabled people based on medical and biological research (Rioux and Bach, 1994). Even now this perspective of disability research is being done and used for medicine and rehabilitation, the objective is medical cure and prevention (Barnes, 2014b). It also served to oppress disabled people by depoliticizing the political (French, 1994, French and Swain, 2000). For example, in one project on investigating disabled people's lives, the nature of the survey was such that unconsciously it conveyed the message that death is better than being disabled (Abberley, 1992).

Rejection of such disability research gave rise to the development of the social model within disability research. Demonstrating that:

> Equality can no longer be ignored in the research agenda. Disability is not measles. It is not a medical condition that needs to be eliminated from the population. It is a social status and

> the research agenda must take into account the political implications attached to that status. The developing theory of disability is an exciting advance in this field and promises much more fruitful results than the limited and singular positivist scientific research of the past (Rioux and Bach, 1994: 19).

Disability research has now become an established academic discipline which, having its origins in activism, maintains a concern with issues of social justice (Grue, 2011). Influenced largely by feminism and the recognition that women's emancipation was brought about because women were considered inferior and need to be recognized in society in much the same way that disabled people are absent from the mainstream. A feminist research approach 'creates the space for an absent-subject, and an absent experience, that is to be filled with the presence and spoken experience of actual women speaking and in the actualities of their everyday worlds' (Smith, 1987: 107). Similarly, within disability research an individual's disability is a personal issue that needs to become political for disability activism to take place (Morris, 1992). The proposition is that, when experiences of disability cannot be explained by bodily limitations, then society needs to be made aware of the disabling social, environmental and attitudinal barriers, which are a daily part of disabled people's lives (Bhavnani, 1990, Stanley and Wise, 1993, Morris, 1996, Morris, 1998).

Additionally, disability research needs to focus on the alienated knowledge produced by the disabled research participant (Oliver, 1992). This alienation, or isolation of knowledge, occurs during the research process, when knowledge is being taken from the disabled research participant but only part of it is used that benefits the research agenda. This consequently leaves the disabled research participant feeling alienated and isolated from the research by 'using the person for someone else's ends (and not) the person's actions' (Rowan, 1981: 93). Thus, disability research should accurately capture and reflect disability experiences, providing sufficient information that can be used effectively to enhance disabled people's lives by the creation of policies and practises that improve their social material conditions (Morris, 1992). Furthermore, disability research must acknowledge disabled people's struggles, recognising that disability is not just limited to medical consequences, but is also a political and social issue.

Thus, the aim must be producing disability research knowledge that is honest, reliable and is effectively used for re-developing better accessibilities, policies and practises (Rioux et al., 2015). For example, in 1989 the British Council of disabled people (BCODP) commissioned research on Community Care and Independent Living for insights into disabled people's lives (Barnes, 1992c). The findings and knowledge gained were used for redeveloping policies and further used for training and presentation purposes to organizations responsible for disabled people's care (Ward and Flynn, 1994, Barnes and Sheldon, 2007). Hence, when disability research is based on the social model, it

locates and makes visible ableism within the society's structures, including its values, mode of production, political-economy and physical environment. Furthermore, it assists government agencies to create legislation and to supply adequate disabled people's services (Farmer and Macleod, 2011, Barnes, 2013a). In 2005, research done by the Rowntree Foundation established outcomes that the poverty rate for disabled people was roughly double that of non-disabled people. This gave rise to the development of policies and legislation against discrimination within the European Union (EU, 2008/9). This demonstrates that disability research assists in making amendments and informing society, through recognizing and respecting disabled people's citizenship, culture and identity (Drake, 1997, Ellen, 2009), which are essential for the enhancement of policies, practises and other services related to disabled people's lives (Mulligan, 2010). In short, disability research seeks to eradicate social disability oppression by opening new fields of inquiry, acknowledging disability experience and altering, refining or challenging old truths about disability (Lamond, 2017). All this is achieved through conducting efficient and productive disability research. The next section turns to explaining the significant praxis used when conducting disability research.

5.8 Disability research praxis

> 'It is important to admit that we study things that trouble us or intrigue us, beginning from our own standpoints. But what makes writing about our lives social science and not a novel? How do we find the parallels in our experiences to make sense of our own routines, or chaos for that matter?' (Hertz, 1997: XVI).

It has been contended that when conducting good disability research, the social relations of research production should focus on society's oppressive barriers to enhance the lives of disabled people (Barnes and Mercer, 1997b). For this purpose, research praxis should prioritise critical approaches towards inquiry 'openly-committed to critiquing the status quo and building a more just-society' (Lather, 2017: 14). Therefore, disability research praxis should reflect the struggle of disabled people, challenging oppression experienced in their daily lives. It should consider researchers/academics becoming associates, acquaintances and allies with other disabled researchers/academics and disabled people, using their expertise knowledge in conducting disability research, in order to address disabled people's struggles against oppression in society to provide recommendations with the mutual consensus of disabled people themselves (Branfield, 1998). As previously highlighted, developing a research methodology which claims to be based on active interpretations of disabled people's emancipation and liberation has drawn heavily on the women's liberation movement and feminist research praxis, which is considered further below.

5.9 Contribution of the feminist theory towards disability research praxis

The intention of feminist theory/feminism has always been towards the development of research praxis that allows women to fully express their experiences (Mies et al., 1980). It is suggested that, 'starting-off research from women's lives will generate less partial and distorted accounts not only of women's lives but also of men's lives and of the whole social order' (Harding, 1993: 56). Hence, giving a voice to society's non-dominant people who are given little or no part in society is imperative, because once the minorities and their oppressions are understood, then the focus is on rectifying the inevitably myopic views of the dominant group. (Haraway, 1988, Harding, 2004). Its epistemology and methodology plays a fundamental role in conducting social research (Lather, 1988), identifying and understanding oppression, which is then investigated through embedded social relations within the political aspects of society. Furthermore, Harding (1987: 181) argues:

> Once we undertake to use women's experience as a resource to generate scientific problems, hypotheses and evidence, to design research for women, and to place the researcher in the same critical plane as the research subject, traditional epistemological assumptions can no longer be made.

For this purpose, interactive and empowering processes are required between researcher and research participant, engaging trust and mutual understanding. This is accomplished through personal involvements, including ethnography, auto-ethnography and in-depth interviewing to understand, accommodate and analyse the effects of social location on epistemic methods and knowledge construction. Hence, valuing knowledge collection continuously and the goal is purely enquiry (Oakley, 1981).

To achieve this, feminist research ensures an active involvement of participants during the research process. The researcher does not use rigid structured interviews to control the research outcomes; instead using unstructured, informal interviewing in a process that involves the notions of reciprocity, friendship, and collaboration (Ribbens, 1989). Such an approach towards research empowers the participant by enabling them to provide a significant contribution towards the description and analysis of the social issues in the research. Firstly, it removes the veil of invisibility surrounding the participant's everyday lives; secondly, it provides a therapeutic dimension to the process, i.e. participants have been able to reflect on and re-evaluate their experience as part of the interview process. Thirdly, which is last but not the least, incorporating marginalised voices can become 'subversive' in a number of ways, for example, the exposition of the participant's experiences that can challenge the widely held beliefs about the nature of participant's social circumstances.

Therefore, a feminist theory perspective not only goes beyond analysis and description of the role played by social location in structuring and shaping knowledge into a normative thesis, but also involves transformative objectives; creating a more socially just world. Thomson (2002) suggests, 'it broadens inquiries and questions presumptions made about the marginalized, in the past'. Concentrating on the entire 'prism through which one can gain a broader understanding of society and human experience' (Linton, 1998: 118). As Harding states, it 'maps how a social and political disadvantage can be turned into an epistemic, scientific and political advantage' (Harding, 2004: 7).

Feminism articulates and recognises an injustice of disadvantaged or/and minority group's perspectives, because their viewpoints are typically absent from the perspective that dominates society at large. It also contributes privileged status to non-dominant groups, by reducing or/and eliminating injustice (Smith, 1974, Hartsock, 1983, MacKinnon, 1983, Noddings, 1990, Oliver, 1992, Ruddick, 1995, Janack, 1997, Mahowald, 1998, Barnes and Mercer, 2004b). Particularly marginalised groups in society include those based on race, disability, age, gender and sexual orientation (Treiman and Hartmann, 1981, Smith, 1987, Oliver, 1992, Mahowald, 1998). For all these reasons feminist research has directly contributed and applied to the development of praxis towards quality disability research. During the 1990s the emancipatory research method of researching disability was extended to disability research by Mike Oliver, proposing that it should affect disabled people's total environment by empowering them to use research outcomes to directly improve their lives (Barnes and Mercer, 1997a). In the next section the emancipatory disability research method will be analysed in detail.

5.10 Emancipatory disability research: Suggestions towards a solution

> 'There is universal agreement among researchers that it must be collaborative. The aim is to empower those with whom he/she works to improve their condition' (Gergen, 1999: 100).

It is identified that when conducting disability research an approach should be adopted that ensures research is owned and controlled by the disabled research participants, making a positive difference in society (Oliver, 1992, Barnes and Mercer, 1997a, French and Swain, 2004). However, 'research in academia, government organization and medicine tends to be owned and controlled by researchers, or by those who, in turn, own and control the researchers' (Brechin, 1993: 73). This may include, large research institutions, having considerable potential to influence the direction and character of research. Furthermore, the researcher is considered responsible for controlling the research design also, by implementation, analysis and dissemination of research findings. Consequently, the disabled research participants are only used to fulfil the research agenda and then alienated from the research process (Oliver, 1992, Barnes and Mercer, 1997a). This constitutes using research methods

as an exchange commodity for advancing the academic researcher's own status and interests (Finkelstein, 1985).

In order to counter all of the above characteristics, an emancipatory disability research approach should be considered when conducting effective disability research. This is because it fully involves the disabled participant in the research consultation, steering, advising and deciding on the research aims and outcomes (Barnes, 2014b). The disabled participants are required to take charge of the research agenda, via facilitating the process on their terms, deciding on appropriate evaluation criteria and directly benefitting from the outcome. Therefore, it aims to cultivate themes of participation, partnership, consultation and transformation by making visible the lives of disabled people involved, promoting political-awareness of disability within society (Barnes, 2002, McColl et al., 2013).

According to Deleuze (1997: 63) the overall perception of the emancipatory approach is the idea to conserve, identify and authenticate particular understandings of a marginalized group, like disability within the society. Hence, the emancipatory disability research paradigm is based on 'reciprocity, gain and empowerment', adopted from the feminist theory (Oliver, 1992: 111). Suggesting that researchers/academics are accountable to disabled participants, empowering disability and consequently developing a change for disabled people's betterment by developing an agreement amongst the researchers that the guiding principle of the emancipatory disability paradigm is the social model (Danieli and Woodhams, 2005), which is rooted in the growth and struggle of the DPM (Oliver, 1996b, Priestley, 1997).

Acknowledging and representing the struggle, energy, and intensities of the disabled person's experiences requires solutions towards eradicating barriers (Mercieca and Mercieca, 2010):

> In essence, emancipatory research is about the empowerment of disabled people through the transformation of the material and social relations of research production. In contrast to traditional investigative approaches, the emancipatory disability research agenda warrants the generation of and production of meaningful and accessible knowledge about the various structures, i.e. economic, political, cultural and environmental, that created and sustained the multiple deprivations encountered by the overwhelming majority of disabled people and their families (Barnes, 2003b: 6).

Hence, in order to carry out emancipatory disability research, barriers and disadvantages faced by disabled people must be identified, understood and then the necessary actions need to be taken for its removal from society (Farmer and Macleod, 2011).

This does not at all mean that emancipatory research cannot be done by non-disabled academics, because they have not personally experienced disabling barriers or they lack authenticity, giving a free licence to disabled researchers to research disability (Branfield, 1998). As, Barnes and Mercer (1997a: 6) suggest that, 'disabled and non-disabled researchers live in a disablist society and can both contribute to disability research'. For example, emancipatory disability research was conducted by disabled and non-disabled academics/researchers, consisting of 368 disabled-participants. Investigating by sharing life-stories and discovering that isolation, neglect, abuse and violence increased lack of access to social, health, education and livelihood-opportunities, playing a significant role in causing disability barriers. The results of this research allowed the Health Centre involved to identify disabled people's barriers, altering their lives successfully. Thus, suggesting that an 'emancipatory research yields rich data, facilitates ownership and possibly future sustainability' (Deepak et al., 2014: 1).

Therefore, emancipatory disability research empowers disabled people by acknowledging their struggle to control the research decision-making processes and achieving freedom from societal oppression and discrimination. Furthermore, this social order it not only achieved by the struggle of disabled people themselves, but also involves cooperation and advocacy of disabled and non-disabled academics (Oliver, 1992). However, there is a tension in these arguments that is considered further in the following section.

5.11 Who should do research on disability?

> 'Why, says the highly competent non-disabled person, does it matter who researches disability? As long the research is conducted and voices are heard, what's the problem? And threatened (non-disabled) researchers close those big inaccessible doors to the academy again' (Jacobs, 2010: title).

Disability research within social-science has increasingly become a contested field of study (Ellen, 2009, Grue, 2011, Lamond, 2017, Shakespeare, 2008, Oliver, 2017). One aspect of this contestation is the debate on the importance of whether a non-disabled researcher is appropriate in conducting disability research (Rioux and Bach, 1994, Stone and Priestley, 1996, Barnes and Mercer, 1997a, Kitchin, 2000a). As noted in Chapter Two disabled people were largely marginalised within the political processes and the media structures that influence public and policy discussion (Kitchin, 1998, Beauchamp-Pryor, 2011). Even now, their exclusion from academic and institutional research, political think-tanks, charity and pressure-groups can be observed (Campbell and Oliver, 2013, Barnes, 2013a).

> There appears to be a growing move amongst non-disabled people, who research and work in our area, to justify their involvement. However, their attempts at justification are doomed to failure' (Branfield, 1998: 143).

However, in reality when conducting disability research involvement of non-disabled researchers/academics can become complicated, difficult, problematic and sometimes impossible as non-disabled people have not experienced disability oppression as an entire socio-political reality (Barnes and Mercer, 1997a). Although non-disabled people can demonstrate sincerity and sympathy towards disabled people, they will always carry the reminders of domination, oppression and appropriation of ableism (Branfield, 1998, Beauchamp-Pryor, 2011). This is because non-disabled academics/researchers may cause disability research knowledge to be misunderstood and 'even fail to acknowledge the lived-experiences of disabled people who are under the analytical-gaze' (Kitchin, 2000b: 34). Therefore, the relationship between non-disabled researcher and disabled research participants is accentuated by an inherently unequal power dynamic underpinned by the historic subordination of disabled people (Barnes and Mercer, 1996), which may cause research knowledge presentation to be weakened (Stone and Priestley, 1996).

Simultaneously, having a disability does not either give an automatic insight or right into researching disabled people's lives (Barnes et al., 2002). Barnes et al. (2002:187) argue that disabled participants on their own 'can never be autarkic or self-sufficient' they will always need non-disabled allies and associates when conducting disability research. The skills and knowledge of an experienced and sensitive academic, disabled or non-disabled, are required to develop an appropriate research agenda and the non-disabled academic may be able to understand and connect to their own experiences of disempowerment or marginalisation to attain insight into the barriers experienced by disabled people (Duckett, 1998, Priestley, 2004). For this purpose, Oliver and Barnes (1997c: 812) argue 'we would like to see more disabled researchers (and academics) not only in the field of disability research, but in research generally'.

5.12 Conclusion

This Chapter contributes towards answering one of the research questions i.e. 'What research methods contribute to emancipatory disability research?' For this purpose, an outline sketch of the developing historical trends of research within social-sciences were reviewed and linked with the development of disability research. Then highlighted the importance of disability research and concluded by suggesting the necessity of disabled researchers/academics conducting disability research.

For this purpose, an approach towards doing good quality disability research was explored by providing important ethical features that should be considered, ensuring the value of managing an appropriate disability research methodology is necessary, so that the social relations of research production is taken into consideration. Furthermore, the analysis demonstrates the contribution of the feminist theories in the development of a practical and technical approach towards researching disability. Its features, self-reflexivity and self-criticality identifies new and challenging approaches towards doing disability research as a social and technical procedure. Nevertheless, 'it must be politically committed but rigorous', (Barnes and Mercer, 1997a: 7). Emancipatory research methods for researching disability are considered, demonstrating the importance of conducting a quality based disability research as is research praxis, querying knowledge production as part of the epistemology within disability research (Oliver, 1992).

The analysis concludes by detailing the significance of disabled academics because the knowledge creation through research managed and controlled by disabled academics is validly and authentically understood. This is because research conducted and knowledge produced by non-disabled researchers/academics might be misunderstood and misrepresentative, therefore providing incorrect information about disability. It is crucial that the accuracy of the knowledge produced, its dissemination and consequent alterations towards society are an essential concern in justifying good or bad disability research (Tregaskis and Goodley, 2005). Based on this analysis, the next Chapter explains the methodological practices and procedures that were used to produce the knowledge produced for this thesis.

6.0 Chapter Six: Methodological Strategies

6.1 Introduction

This Chapter outlines the philosophical and methodological framework, mapping out the research inquiry plan of this thesis. It provides the philosophical orientation, methodological choices, including processes of deciding the University case-studies and choosing methods for data collection and analysis.

The aim is to enable to answer the main research question:

> What are the barriers and enablers to the employment of disabled academics and what theoretical frameworks can be adopted to understand them?

Since, philosophical grounding is the backbone of any research inquiry (Collier, 1994), the chapter begins with a discussion of the research philosophy orientation. Then the chapter defines the methodological approach and justifies mixed methods employed in the research design, discussing the data collection and the data analysis techniques employed.

This research is motivated by the experiences of the author, which includes a journey into academia and reflecting on her experiences as a disabled academic in England. To incorporate this, she has partly adopted an auto-ethnographic approach (Chapter Seven) incorporated within the research process. According to Oliver (1996b: 170), the role of disabled academics towards studies on disability is in contribution to 'illuminating the interweaving of sectional and societal interests'. Therefore, in line with the spirit of 'nothing about us without us', this research prioritises the experiences and voices of disabled academics (Oliver, 1992: 102).

6.2 Research Philosophy and Self-Reflexivity

> 'Reflexivity is a continual consideration of the ways in which the researcher's social identity and values affect the data gathered and the picture of the social world produced' (Reay, 1996: 59).

Within the world of social sciences it is recognized that researchers bring their reflexivity, i.e. past awareness and personal identities, into knowledge creation (Saldaña, 2015). Thus, painting a picture of the social world that has been influenced by the researcher's social identity and values affecting the data gathered (Reay, 1996).

Reflexivity involves the systematic reflection on how the researcher affects the ongoing flow of everyday life of participants and research procedures (Rossman and Rallis, 1998). It assists in developing relationships between participants and researchers, where the research is understood and negotiated within a social context of the research. It involves an interplay of this sensitivity and

a simultaneous awareness of how ‘self’ and ‘others’ enhances reflexivity of the researcher. Therefore, the ‘researcher values the unique perspective as a source of understanding, rather than something to be cleansed from the study’ (Sokoya, 2006: 869).

Reflexivity plays a major role in investigating workplace management within qualitative research. This is because, exploring the social location including personal biography biases of the researcher might influence the research structure. The researcher’s assumptions and ethical judgement might, therefore, critically affect the entire investigatory research process (Etherington, 2004, Berger, 2015). A researcher cannot be separated from reflexivity because they actively construct all phases of the research process; from the initial stage of topic selection to the final reporting of results. Hence, without the involvement of a researcher, a research project cannot exist (Davies, 1999). Similarly, within this thesis the author’s personal life experiences are recorded, incorporating the author’s struggle to develop employment as a disabled academic constructing a disability identity. Adopting a first-person writing style, the following section discusses the resources and strategies adopted in order to push a way through the stress and strains of academic life.

6.3 How am I influencing my research?

I do not choose to join 'the true-confessions-brigade' (Barnes, 1998: 146), by including a lengthy personal biography. Hence, I will briefly consider the implications of my disabled status on my relationship with the research participants (Finch, 1984, Barnes and Mercer, 2001) and then on the actual process of research production (Sheldon, 2001: 76). I should inform here the reason of my own interest and motivation behind choosing to research disability is that I can no longer walk. It is only because I became disabled during my academic studies that I embarked upon this topic. Otherwise I would have chosen a different course of study and ‘I would certainly not have become involved in disability research’ (Sheldon, 2001: 76). I became disabled during my MSc program course at the University of Bath and my dissertation also concentrated on barriers faced in employment for disabled people. I decided to further my studies by doing in-depth PhD research investigating academia, because I wanted to acquire employment as a disabled academic. For this purpose, my PhD research focusses on the employment experiences of disabled academics within their university environments. In addition there is a conundrum that, whilst university policies and practices have made it possible and much more normal for disabled students to achieve higher education, this is not the case for disabled academic employees (THE, 2017).

For this purpose, I need to initially understand the nature and extent of oppression experienced by disabled academics. Hence, as a disabled academic myself, doing research on other disabled academics, I am, both 'inside' and ‘outside’ the research culture, so my research is as much about my own experiences as it is about others (Oakley, 1981). According to Wheatley (1994: 422), it is

important to note that, ‘relations, practices and representations as well as the metaphors we use to make sense of them are contextually contingent, their character is shaped by who we look at, from where and why we are looking in the first-place'.

It is true that ‘the closer the subject-matter to our own lives and experiences, the more we can probably expect our own beliefs about the world to enter into and shape our work, to influence the very questions we pose our conceptions of how to approach those questions and the interpretations we generated from our findings (Du Bois, 1979a: 105, Hesse-Biber, 2011). Also, there is a fine dividing line between identification with one's research subjects and their exploitation (Reay, 1996). Thus, I am observing reflexivity, creating a social world through my own social identity and values, affecting the way I gather data. It is also a critically crucial exercise for me to research the oppression experienced by disabled academics, but I also have to be particularly careful to ensure the data collected from disabled academic participants does not get corrupted by my own biases to avoid colluding with the established hegemony (Gramsci, 1971a), because ‘intent is no guarantee of outcome’ (Barton, 1996: 6, Barnes and Mercer, 1997b: 159). The following section identifies the methods I have chosen.

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the employment experiences of disabled academics. For this purpose, a research approach is chosen towards orientating a social constructionist ontology and epistemology, to examine the social, physical and workplace barriers in employment for disabled academics (Williams and Mavin, 2012). According to Crotty (1998), this is gained through interaction between the individual and the researcher, assisting in knowledge construction, thus, creating knowledge of the social world. This interaction and relation should not become static or fixed, rather, the knowledge created and understood about the social world is valued as an ‘on-going achievement, of human-interaction’ (Watson, 2001: 223). Social constructivism requires an understanding that people are always in the process of constructing knowledge through processes of ‘actions, interactions and the local orchestration of relationships’ (Chia, 1995: 581). Therefore, there is an inter-dependent relationship between ontology (in this case how disabled academic employment is perceived) and epistemology (how the author as a researcher shall be collecting knowledge), informing and depending upon each other (Stanley and Wise, 1993), which is explained below.

6.4 Ontology: Theoretical assumptions

Ontology is the reflection of what constitutes reality (Lehrer, 2018). Therefore, at the beginning of any research, the social researcher should always query the ontological position of their research in order to discover presumed historical and/or contemporary theories, worldly perspectives and understanding towards the real social entity that is to be researched (Mason, 1996, Nowotny, 2015).

Such a understanding enables this research to acknowledge the social world constructed of multiple meanings (Zilber, 2017), thus, acknowledging and appreciating differences (Hosking, 1999). This research is based on the principles of social-constructivism, thus, the author necessarily needs to orientate herself into acknowledging the premise of the taken for granted (Burr, 2003) or common-sense (Gramsci, 1971). For example, the view that the provision of reasonable adjustments is an unfair practise, giving disabled employees' advantage rather than creating a level playing field. Or disability research by non-disabled researchers that has assumed an individualistic personal tragedy perspective towards disability, suggested in Chapter Four, where the ontological base perpetuates the hegemony that disabled people's disability is their own problem. This is also the ontological position of this thesis, focussing on a medical model to understand the ableist hegemony at the academic workplace.

6.5 Epistemology: Study of knowledge and justified belief

Epistemology considers appropriate ways of enquiring into the nature of the world (Lehrer, 2018), thus proposing a study of obtaining knowledge about social-reality (Bryman, 2015). To accomplish this, the author of this thesis has understood how the world is shaped by the medical model of disability viewing the world as non-disabled. Her epistemological position challenges this ontological understanding by creating knowledge that is useful in understanding this ableist hegemonic world. In short, how the world is viewed by the researcher creates valuable knowledge that identifies ableism, which creates disability as 'sub-normal' when knowledge comes from the experience of being disabled in an ableist society. For this purpose, Gramscian and feminist theories, as well as the concepts of the social and medical models of disability and the radical and liberal approaches to equality are used to identify the actions practised in the employment of disabled academics that render them sub-normal.

It is suggested by Oliver (1992), that epistemology of disability must be rooted in disabled people's experiences of oppression, assuming that disabled people are the experts about their own experiences and quality data is generated by allowing them to describe their experiences (Barnes and Mercer, 1997b). Also, epistemological knowledge is subjective because its construction is subject to individual interpretation only collected and interpreted through individual participant's explanations of situations and environments, (Bryman, 2015). Adopting an interpretive social constructionist research approach makes it important to understand the multiple realities with different internal logics and the contextual factors that influence, determine and affect the interpretations of different disabled academics participating in this research (Blaikie, 1993, Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). For this purpose, individual experiences, memories and expectations of disabled academics are understood, by using an Oral History interviewing narrative inquiry process. These accounts are used to highlight and explain similarities and differences of workplace barriers for

disabled academics, wherein the barriers are constructed and interpreted through interactions with the wider social systems (Bogdan and Biklen, 1992, Guba and Lincoln, 1994, Yin, 2017). These experiences are located at different levels of analysis between and within experiences and insights developed through disabled academic participants' in their different university employment contexts. For this purpose, Layder's (1993) research map has been adopted, explained in the section below.

6.6 Research Design

As noted above, this thesis is based on the principles of constructionist-interpretivism, incorporating a detailed empirical study. For this purpose Layder (1993) research map has been adapted to illustrate the specific steps of data collection and analysis adopted for this research. It is used to assist in understanding the effects of the deeply intertwined behavioural subjective systems and objective structural factors encountered in the application of methodologies and strategies designed to increase knowledge of disability. This includes examining the mutually influenced factors and processes of drawing upon different types of theory and evidence, in a way that seeks to determine the validity of certain propositions or claims (Layder, 1993).

Table 6.1 Title of Table? adapted from Layder (1993)

Research-Factors	**Research Focus and Objective**	**Key Methods**	**Theoretical Consideration**
Context (macro (social-forms)	Focus: Disability in the context of able-bodied society. Objective: investigating legislations, policies & practises, encouraging disabled people's employment into academia.	Literature review Documents: EqA legislations Public-Employment-Policies & Practises. Employment-Policies & Practises in Higher Education.	Social and Medical model. Liberal and Radical equality approaches. Gramsian theories of Hegemony, Ideology, Intellectuals, Common & Good-sense.
Setting (intermediate-environment)	Focus: Policies and practises, and able-bodied academics' dominated Universities. Objective: to determine whether the current conceptualisation of Universities adequately explain the experiences of disabled academics.	Literature review Documents: Universities Policy review. Interviews of University HR. Three University case-studies.	Diversity management: business-case and social justice case. Universities' policies and practises, theories about Disability EDI.
Situated Activity (dynamics of interaction)	Focus: disabled academics. Objective: to examine and investigate disabled academic employees University disability-access opportunity and constraints.	Literature review Documents: Primary-data: OH interviews with key-informants. Policy-reviews: Universities case-studies.	(As above).

Self (biographical-experiences)	The author's own experience of being a disabled academic.	Literature review Documents: Capturing my own experiences in a daily-diary. Reviewing literature on other disable academics.	Presenting self-biographical experiences in the form of an auto-ethnography.

This research-map has four distinct research factors namely context, setting, situated activity and self, all influenced by historical backgrounds. These levels of analysis represent a shift from the micro to the macro level in society, suggesting a development of a changing social context, from individual to culture within the thesis structure. Self is the starting-point of this research, initiated by social experiences of having a disability and seeking employment within academia. The next level of analysis is to investigate disabled academics' employment circumstances and experiences at their universities.

According to the table above, context and setting represents the wider social macrostructure in which situated activity takes place (Layder, 1993). For example, collecting knowledge and information through investigating disability theories in the context of able-bodied society. In this thesis Gramscian theories, the models of disability and the liberal and radical approaches to equality are used to identify ableism. Empirical data is gathered from the workplace in the form of legal and policy documents on university employment found on websites. These policies and practises are mostly created by able-bodied people without any understanding about disability. Hence, there is a risk of instigating ableism as the normative assumption (Goodley, 2016) and also ensuring a business case, rather than a social justice case for disabled within the workplace.

This then influences the situated activity, which is about investigating the experiences of disabled academics, so OH with disabled academics is used to understand and define their situations. Using 'self' encouraged the exploration of disability, offering an opportunity of empowerment and recognising the need to share power (Bellamy and Schecter, 1993) with other disabled academics in order to focus upon gaining and benefiting from the voices of the research participants (Barnes and Oliver, 1998). Thus, this research aims to work with disabled academics, suggesting that a research strategy is adopted that informs social practices (Barnes, 2006). Incorporating 'self' also gave rise to an auto-ethnographic investigation reported in Chapter Seven

It is also recommended that any social research on disability should be carried out from a social model perspective. Understanding, that any bodily impairment is not the cause of disability (Finkelstein, 2001a), disability is socially constructed making it necessary to examine social responses towards people with bodily-impairments (Oliver, 1992, Oliver, 1996a). For this purpose, this research

has used a range of social/qualitative research approaches to understand the perspectives of the participant, giving insight into people's living world (Atkinson et al., 1988).

Furthermore, using Layder's (1993) research process calls for definitive accounts which can further be explained in light of new-theoretical and/or empirical evidence, which can 'overturn accepted beliefs' (Dowding, 2004: 142). Therefore, situating this thesis within an interpretivist-constructionist design provides a continuum of social realities. Additionally, this process critically acknowledges the risks of re-establishing hegemony by accepting the social model, reflected in the methodological choices, recommended in the section below.

6.7 Methodological choices

Methodological choices are important when studying phenomena that are unclear within real-life contexts (Yin, 2017). For example, historically non-disability was a normative assumption, whereas, disability was rejected as a social phenomenon. Although these concepts are not always clearly apparent, they have given rise to ableism within the workplace. Thus, creating an interesting research problem that strengthens the purpose of study and relevance of the theoretical framework (Remenyi and Williams, 1998).

A case-study approach was chosen to study the operation of the theoretical models in the academic workplace, allowing the researcher to provide richly descriptive findings and paint a detailed picture of the research phenomena (Kidder, 1982) and to provide insights, which enables theoretical propositions (Yin, 2017). Furthermore, a case study design facilitates advancing theory development because it is an iterative research process, presenting a degree of flexibility that accommodates any unanticipated emerging themes (Gersick, 1988, Feagin et al., 1991). Using such an approach provides an exploratory character, enabling the acceptance and adjustment of new emerging data to reflect the major issues as they are further discovered (Harris and Sutton, 1986). Furthermore, using a case-study approach focusses on situations taking place every day, offering an in-depth inquiry, focusing attention on narrative detail and insights from complex stories to access richer information (Flyvbjerg, 2006).

6.8 The Case-study Choice

Three Universities based in England have been studied within the context of disabled academics' employment. Each University is seen as an individual case-study, allowing characterization of each to be bounded and specific (Stake, 2005). The selection criteria of the three Universities was of fundamental importance to the thesis, as they are the catalyst for knowledge, insight and the development of theory generating interesting and rich information of the phenomenon under inquiry. To ensure the credibility of the research, it was important that the case-study selection process was not a haphazard activity (Yin, 2017). Instead, it required a rather careful process, based on the principles of transparency and reflexivity from the author of this thesis.

For this purpose, the selection-process was strategic, purposive and justified on the grounds of its comprehensive types of University case-studies from which data was gathered. All three of the selected University case-studies come from different sectors (Anderson, 2010). This was a good sampling strategy process because, although the intention is not to generalise findings to all universities, instead data has been gathered from a broad spectrum of types of university.

Simultaneously, this research is investigating a taboo subject within the workplace that has conventionally been kept silent. This is because the presumption was/is that disabled people cannot be part of the workplace (Foster and Wass, 2013). Therefore, it was necessary that the three University case-studies had an ample number of disabled academics and displayed diverse knowledge about disabled academics' employment within the University workplace, providing a gateway to understand the issues that were central to this thesis. This challenge of choosing three appropriate case-study Universities that fitted the aforementioned criteria was partially overcome through initial in-depth-investigation, which gave a richer insight into the research context and signposted the author towards choosing appropriate case-studies. For this purpose, the background of universities was carefully considered for the selection-process of case-studies.

The next step was to contact HR departments of universities to find out whether they would be interested in participating in this PhD research. Unfortunately, only a handful of universities showed interest and due to time limitations, the author was unable to wait for a prolonged time period for replies from universities. This phase of the research was fundamental as it painted a picture of the landscape in which the universities operated, situating it within its context and highlighting the external influences that were encouraging to recognise disability within the university academic workplace. Doing this narrowed the initial University case-studies selection down to four, which made it possible to choose appropriate case-studies that suited the aims of the study.

Thereafter, the researcher contacted the four chosen Universities to discuss the research and their academic workplace responses. This gave rise to the elimination of one university, which was unable to comply with providing adequate time for the empirical inquiry to take place.

The selected case-studies are coded 1UCS, 2UCS and 3UCS, in order to maintain the anonymity of the University. When doing the background investigation during the selection of the three University case-studies, it was discovered that all three Universities state they have a strong belief in disability EDI. The three University case-studies are explored in detail in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten. A brief description of the three University case-studies is provided below.

6.9 One Case-Study University (1UCS)

The 1UCS mentioned in Chapter Eight, was established in the mid eighteenth century and is a leading 'red-brick university'. It claims to have approximately 9,000 students, and 3,000 employees from all over the world (HESA, 2016).

6.10 Two Case-Study University (2UCS)

The 2UCS mentioned in Chapter Nine, was founded in the twentieth century and is a post 1992 'new university'. It is ranked among the top five universities in the UK. They have approximately 31,508 students and 4,530 members of staff from different parts of the world (HESA, 2016).

6.11 Three Case-Study University (3UCS)

The 3UCS mentioned in Chapter Ten, came into being in the late twelfth century and is rated as one of the prestigious universities in the world. It is an 'elite university' having more than 18,000 students and nearly 9,000 employees from all over the world (HESA, 2016).

All three University case-studies, as mentioned earlier, are concerned with tackling disability discrimination. For this purpose, they welcomed the author to initiate the research and requested to be informed about the research outcomes.

6.12 The Narrative Inquiries Choice

Another methodological choice that has been used towards the investigation of this research is a narrative inquiry approach. It is a recognised and established methodology used when researching the workplace (Mumby, 1987, Lieblich et al., 1998, Rhodes and Brown, 2005, Harter, 2017). The method allows individuals to describe misfortune and attribute agency to self and others, providing an enlarged and envisioned analysis of the workplace (Burke, 1974). It facilitates reproduction of meanings by acknowledging cultural norms, negotiated and transformed through social practices within the workplace. The aim is to enable an exploratory approach, lending itself to a collaborative approach between researcher and research participants (Dutton and Ragins, 2017). Hence, narrative inquiry is a way of acknowledging experiences of participants who collaborate through social interaction containing stories of experiences that are relived and retold (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990). Adopting such an approach depicts reflective interpretations that connects human experiences to events happening in time (Sharifi, 2002). According to Czarniawska (2014), when people are asked about their workplace experiences, they often describe these in the form of a narrative account.

A narrative inquiry approach is associated with life, subjectivity, culture and truth, as a process of making sense of experiences and then connecting them with human actions (Polkinghorne, 1995), highlighting the lived-experience through storytelling (Kononenko, 2011) . The method sets up the stage for research participants to speak and be heard (Padgett, 2016). It articulates and amplifies oppressed and excluded voices of the under privileged (Sandelowski, 1991). French (2017) offers an

example of how this method can be used to value the voices raised by addressing the silence and resistance of disabled people. Therefore, narrative inquiry fits with the intention of this thesis is to create and operationalization the lived experience of disabled academics instead of simply locating and describing the disability barriers. Furthermore, part of the research includes an auto-ethnography, drawing upon personal academic experiences of disability. Thus, the author is also experiencing the research process along with research participants (Ellis and Bochner, 2000) in the three University case-studies.

Two further methods based on narrative inquiry have been employed. They are semi-structured interviews, used to investigate the views of HR managers and OH interviewing processes used to explore the experiences of disabled academics, accommodating the majority of the narrative inquiry procedure. The next section explains the primary and secondary research methods in more detail.

6.13 Research Methods: Primary data collection

The primary data collection comprises of documentary data analysis, semi-structured and OH interviews, which includes recording and measuring the activities and ideas of participant's experiences (Walliman, 2004). As noted above, in this thesis, having a disability is beneficial for the author, as disability oppression and disability barriers are understood through the structures and practices (Kelly et al., 1994, Priestley, 1998, Oliver, 1992), of the primary data-collection

6.14 Documentary data

Within this thesis the documentary data comprised of the three University case-study's formal workplace policy documents. They were analysed individually to investigate whether each of the University workplace is operating a disability-friendly and accessible environment and how the participating University created their own understanding of disability. For this purpose, each of the University's formal policies were extracted from their website, as according to the EqA all public sector organizations (including universities) are required to make their formal policy documents publicly available (EHRC, 2011b).

6.15 Semi-structured interviews

Semi-structured interviews are a purposeful discussions between two or more people (Kahn and Cannell, 1957) offering insights into the change and maintenance of systems, behaviours, relationships and organising-functions (Van Teijlingen, 2014). Semi-structured interviews are considered appropriate as they provide an opportunity to extract these perceptions and also allowing them to explain their understanding (Mason, 1996) of disability at the workplace. For this purpose, the author has conducted seven semi-structured interviews with the University HR managers.

Using this method means not hindering or restricting content or inhibiting issues raised by the researcher, rather, accommodating flexibly emergent ongoing issues (Rabionet, 2011). Therefore, an interview schedule was created in which a set of outline question could be changed, adapted or modified accordingly (Robson, 2002) (Appendix 1). The semi-structured interviews took approximately an hour each. The author ensured to ask certain specific questions, but they were not in any particular order and each interview was composed slightly differently. The purpose of these interviews was to provide contextual information about the University's workplace management, policies and practises regarding disabled academic employees, providing the researcher with a narrative about the back-ground functions of the University's workplace and indirectly the approaches used towards E&D.

The participants' questions were divided into three categories, Structure, HR-functions and the Culture of the workplace, explained below.

6.16 The first category

The questions focussed on the Structure of the workplace, regarding procedures and practises. For example, processes of disability disclosure, policy-making, meeting the equality objectives and the collaboration of various departments and managers to achieve workplace objectives.

6.17 The second category

These questions focussed on the HR functions of the workplace, regarding the monitoring processes of recruitment, selection and competency of disabled academics. For example, inquiring about collection of statistical data, providing training, measuring procedures of retirement and redundancy of disabled academics.

6.18 The third category

These questions focussed on the culture of the workplace, incorporating questions about the character and personality of the workplace. For example, questioning the practises, shared-assumptions, values, and beliefs, which governs employer behaviours towards disability.

It was discovered through these semi-structured interviews that all three University's HR management had to face numerous obstacles in supporting their disabled academics, especially, when dealing with issues of the workplace culture.

The next section turns to explaining the OH interviews, the second type of narrative inquiry approach used in this thesis.

6.19 Oral Histories (OH)

According to Thompson (1969) this interview technique emerged due to the fierce criticism towards the interview methods of positivist social scientists and traditional documentary historians. This method is widely used to collect data about most aspects of people's lives, including health, family-life, work experience and political involvement (Thompson, 1988, Vansina, 1985, Yow, 1994), as 'it

allows description of feelings, emotion, memory and identity, which more formal documentary sources may fail to pick up' (Haynes, 2006: 5). This method forms an in-depth life-history interview, with a biographical background and personal narratives (Reinharz, 1992). An OH interviewing process differs from the classic in-depth interviewing procedure as it produces a detailed account of experiences, instead of 'snap-shots' (Yow, 2014). The method focuses on asking open-ended questions to produce accounts that traverse entire experiences (Ritchie, 2014), including the participant's past, ranging widely over different topics (Connelly and Clandinin, 1990). Therefore, the interviewer-interviewee relationship is transformed into narrator and listener (Chase, 2005).

The OH method also helps in facilitating connections between roles of the social groups and provides insights into the lives of others, because the narrator weaves their story with their other significant experiences (Charles, 1970). Within feminist research such interviewing techniques are called 'phenomenological interviewing' (Reinharz, 1992: 21), because they are interviewee guided investigations of lived experiences, that ask almost no prepared questions, to probe narrative aspects that maximise discovery and description. Additionally, it captures the lives of minorities, underprivileged and the marginalised histories, which are inaccessible through conventional documentary sources. In line with emancipatory research this method seeks to empower and give voice to individual experiences of oppression (Gluck, 1977, Reinharz, 1992, Chamberlayne et al., 2000). It offers an investigatory method of the powerless, giving a voice to the voiceless. Therefore, within this research, OH are used to encapsulate in-depth personal narratives, where the participants are encouraged to reflect on their identity, aspirations, emotions and experiences evaluating the present, re-evaluating the past and anticipating the future as disabled academics.

However, the disabled academic participants in this research are not from totally powerless groups. Rather, they are highly-educated, largely middle-class, literate academics with disabilities. Nonetheless, they still accommodate experiences of remaining silent and hidden, such as demonstrating reluctance towards promotion, lack of reward, underestimated abilities and/or negative attitudes and behaviour towards their disability. Hence, an OH interviewing technique is optimal for data-collection for this research, as it focusses on individuals' personal histories, perspectives and experiences (Perks and Thomson, 2015), particularly regarding-marginalisation and suppression (Perks, 2010)

OH interviews have seldom been used when investigating disability within management research (Blackford, 1981, Schuchman, 1984, Parker, 1984, Longmore, 1988). In this research they are used to consider the impact of academic marginalization .Thus, offering an opportunity to explore critical lived employment experiences of disabled academics, allowing the author to 'prise-open the different dimensions of lived totality' (Gottfried, 1998: 452) to reconnect reality (Crook, 1998).

Furthermore, by encouraging critical reflection it is hoped this method will support emancipatory research by becoming a vehicle for change (Edwards, 1990).

For the OH interviews an informal prompt interview schedule was created (see appendix 2). The schedule contained four topics on disabled academics' employment, extracted from the literature and existing research. This was never really required for prompting in most of the OH interviews and was only used to keep a check by the author. Furthermore, the background life histories of disabled academics were also inquired on, which is presented before the interview analysis of each University case-study Chapter. This has been done to enrich and achieve the complete notion of the OH interviewing process. The following provides short descriptions the topics that were used in the informal prompt interview schedule.

6.20 Topic 1: Academic with disabilities

This section was about being a disabled academic at their University, recognising a lack of confidence, limitations, strategies they might have adopted towards their employment-progression. These issues were highlighted in the literature mentioned in Chapter Two and Five.

5.21 Topic 2: Workplace attitudes and behaviours

The objective was to identify the impact of attitudes and behaviours of the managers towards disabled academics. This topic was developed by the author's own experiences at the workplace and also through the literature in Chapter Two.

5.22 Topic 3: Disability Policies and management practises at their University

This topic was informed by literature on disabled employees' inclusion and management mentioned in Chapter Two.

5.23 Topic 4: Providing University reasonable adjustments

The aim of this section was to ensure the participants spoke about their University recognising their disability requirements, then providing them support accordingly. This topic was informed by literature in Chapter Two and Four.

The author ensured that there was maximum coverage of these issues during the OH interview. However, the disabled academic participants were not expected to provide a complete detailed narrative, as it is impossible to remember and describe the entire situation of the experience (Lewis, 2015). Therefore, the author supported their narration by using a conversational probing approach to encourage the disabled academic participants to recall and narrate the issues related to their experiences.

Each OH interview lasted approximately between two to four hours, depending on the disabled participant's availability. It took place within the disabled academic participant's workplace, often their office. During the interview regular breaks were taken, for tea, coffee or maybe a stroll within

their University. Notes were made (recorded) throughout the OH interview about the participant's experiences to ensure an accurate record.

During the interview, the author provided opportunities for self-reflection. For example, one of the going-back prompt questions was:

"Could I ask you to reflect back upon your employment-progression?"

Doing this often led to participants to recall and offer details of other related experiences that were initially not spoken about. Just before ending the OH interview the author asked the participant, if they would like to add something to their interview or suggest any recommendations to their University workplace.

5.24 The Interview Process

The interviewing process of both semi-structured and OH interviews generally went smoothly. All the interview participants were extremely interested in the research topic and keen to take part in this research. They also wanted to be kept informed of the study's conclusions after its completion.

Few of the respondents set a limit on the time they made available for the interviewee. They were all very welcoming and friendly, emphasising that they would be available to assist with further queries in the future if required. This offer was taken up on a few occasions, for clarification of parts of the recorded interview, via emails.

6.25 Transcription of Interviews

After the completion of the digitally recorded interviews, they were transcribed. Transcribing interview data is one of the most time consuming tasks associated with primary data collection methods (Denscombe, 2014). As notified by Bryman (1988), transcription is a relatively unproblematic translation of the spoken into written words. However, transcribing interviews for disability related research is not an easy task. The recordings were of good quality, but the OH interview participants were disabled academics and some of them had difficulty in speaking and the author, as a disabled researcher, had difficulty in physically transcribing.

6.26 Auto-ethnography

Auto-ethnography is a data collection method that uses the researcher's personal experiences to describe, analyse and understand cultural experience (Campbell, 2016), a form of self-narrative, placing self within a social context (Reed-Danahay, 1997a). It is a complex and meaningful phenomena, which develops unique ways of thinking and feeling for people making sense of themselves and each other (Ellis et al., 2010a). Using an auto-ethnographic method towards data-collection in this research allows the author to share her lived-experiences (Ellis et al., 2010b).

Campbell (2016: 1) suggests that using this approach means adopting an 'ultra or hyper reflexive process', because it allows the author to communicate thoughts, feelings and experiences. Furthermore, it is suggested by Ellis et al. (2010a) that, data collected using auto-ethnography contributes to the understanding of micro-level social experiences, which are central to this research.

Auto-ethnography is often criticised for having too much of a reflective nature (Haynes, 2011). However, using a traditional writing style and an acceptable way of doing research is described as a process of 'sucking the life out of the text' (Campbell, 2016: 2). This resonates with Richardson (1992: 131) view of traditional academic writing, where the style is 'deadening even when the topic is riveting'. It is recommended to be a process of storytelling, because it provides a multi-layered knowledge of a phenomenon, which assists in understanding its truths, meanings and place. The thick description embodied in an auto-ethnographic approach can help make sense of one's own experiences. As Tillmann-Healy (1996: 76) explains, in auto-ethnographic research on eating disorders, 'I can show you a view no physician or therapist can, because, in the midst of an otherwise normal life, I experience how a bulimic life feels.' It is further argued that this writing style contains self-reflection to understand multicultural-others, qualitative-inquiry and narrative-writing (Chang, 2008), which is equally important to this research. The author's lived experience as a disabled academic striving to get employment within academia brings her past awareness, experiences and personal identities into the creation of knowledge by using auto-ethnography (see Chapter Seven).

6.27 Secondary data collection

Secondary data involves re-analysing data that has already been collected for some other purpose (Saunders et al., 2011). It is useful in providing support for the research question and assists in detecting research that has already been done. Sources include published or unpublished articles and papers, books and journals from libraries, because they contain the accumulated wisdom on research and cutting-edge ideas, in shaping the direction of research (Denscombe, 2014). For example, the Queen Mary University of London Library has a huge collection of on/offline books, journals and much more. Websites, government publications and official statistics were also useful. For example, web-media contains abundance of information, like the Employers' Forum on Disability www.efd.org.uk, etc.

6.28 Survey data

Survey data assists in gathering information from a large number of people (Morgan and Smircich, 1980). It collects statistical information on populations that are carried out by public and private organizations, like the HESA, ECU, Labour Force Survey (LFS), Office for National Statistics (ONS), which were used for information on disabled academics' employment.

6.29 Analysis and Coding

There are many varied options of analysis and coding (Bryman, 2015), that can be considered for analysing qualitative data. However, the factors determining methods for the analysis of this research were to maintain disability understanding through a detailed insight into the lived-experiences (Schwandt, 1994) of disabled academics. For this purpose, documentary data collection of the three University case-studies, semi-structured interviews with HR managers and OH with disabled academics contributed towards investigating the manipulation, recognition and comparison of perceptions about disability within the academic workplace (Bruyère et al., 2004). This has paved the way to a better theoretical and empirical understanding of the climates of disability within the workplace more generally in order to re-conceptualise disability employment. The next section turns to discussing the stages of coding and analysis used to facilitate this development.

6.30 Documentary data Analysis

Documentary data analysis is the interpretation giving a voice and meaning around an assessment topic of documents belonging to a particular entity (Fitzgerald, 2012). During the analysis process, consideration was given to the source of the information and the purpose for which the document was prepared, because the intended audience it is not always determined, by whom they will be read or how they will be interpreted (Coffey, 2014). For example, the University's equality objectives report which is published every four years acts as an external sales tool to attract a diverse number of employees and students at the same time as fulfilling the legislative requirements that depict universities as equal, diverse and all-inclusive organisations. Such documents tend to present optimistic representations of the workplace and positive predictions for the future. To avoid such misinterpretations of documents, they will be examined under a wider political, social, economic and environmental background (Platt, 1981). This was done through comparing, studying and evaluating against other academic journal articles and books focusing on the subject of EDI management of a workplace. In addition, semi-structured interviews with HR managers and OH interviews with disabled academics were considered to confirm and validate employment policies and practises within the documents. These interviews are also essential primary research methods for data collection, which are explained in the next section.

6.31 Semi-structured-interviews

Initially, to analyse the semi-structured interviews, the interview schedules were used to develop three categories: Structure, HR functions and Culture of the workplace. This was done manually by creating tables in MS-Word and labelling them into categories (Woods, 2011). The data generated in the semi-structured interviews did not directly correspond to the interview schedule because the interviews were semi-informal in style, encouraging free-flowing conversation. It is highly unlikely that semi-informal interview conversations are neatly bundled into small chunks of interview text

ready for the researcher to categorise and analyse (Mason, 1996). Hence, coding was accomplished through rigorous analytical reading of interview transcripts and the development of a number of sub-codes. The author looked for repeated regularities among the transcripts to identify and compare themes for coding purposes. Furthermore, using this approach allowed the author to investigate differences and similarities, providing in-sights into the meaning of disability accessibility or ableism that were the normative assumptions in the three University case-studies.

6.32 OH interviews

Coding of OH interviews was also done manually by creating tables in MS-Word and labelling them into categories (Woods, 2011). The themes were again initially influenced by the question prompts and literature but were developed as other themes were identified when the OH narratives were read in-depth and rigorously analysed. Also, the author's research process experiences, stated in the auto-ethnography Chapter Seven, were used as a reference point for comparison with the disabled academic participants' experiences. Doing this was an essential part of formulating appropriate coding, allowing a detailed interpretative dismantling of the OH narratives for the analysis process. For example, in addition to themes such as employer's attitudes and behaviours, disability disclosure, stigma and stereotyping developed from literature, themes and codes such as 'being an academic with disabilities', 'training on disability awareness', etc. emerged during the OH interviewing process. This was done by identifying connections between codes and the research question, developing fundamental structures of experiences evident within the OH narratives. Furthermore, this process was continuously revised and refined, as themes continued to emerge and new insights developed.

Using such an intense coding process allowed a more detailed analysis to take place. Enabling the author to develop theory by underlying meaning of the disabled academic participants' experiences, evident in the OH-narratives. For example, providing reasonable adjustments to disabled academics at the workplace would suggest increased loyalty of the disabled academics towards the workplace, this was detected during the OH analysis of *Ann* at 2UCS. Although, this was not explicit within the OH interview, it emerged through the coding process of the OH narratives

6.33 Adopting a Manual Interview Data Analysis Approach

No qualitative data analysis computer software was used to analyse the interviews. Instead, tables in MS-Word-documents were used. Adopting a manual approach towards analysing interview data permitted flexibility with revision of the analysis process. For example, it assisted with the organisation of data, which could be reviewed for identification and delineation purposes by the author as a whole document.

This process of identification and comparison of themes and patterns within coding of the semi-structured and OH interviews were all documented on a MS-Word document, grouped-together to formulate the analysis, which is discussed below.

6.34 Presentation of Analysis and the Findings

This section explains the presentation of the analysis and findings of the three University Case-studies contained in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten. Incorporating firstly a concise introduction of the three University case-studies, followed by a summarised analysis of policies and procedures of the three University case-studies.

The large amounts of narrative data generated by the interview participants created fascinating analytical patterns, but had to be sifted. This led to, often, heart-breaking decisions about how to condense the extra-detailed and rich information provided in the narratives to allow the author to interpret the data (Lofland and Lofland, 1995). This was achieved by focussing on the relevant research question to demonstrate the findings, without being unjustifiably drawn into subsidiary issues (Van-Maanen, 2011). This strategy provided a platform for the author to link together important themes within the data and ultimately make linkages between these themes, in order to develop theory from the narratives. The stories of the participants were analysed alongside theoretical constructs and themes, further supported by extra notes taken during the interview process. The aim is to enhance the validity of the inductive process so others understand this development of theory from the participants' stories (Pentland, 1999).

6.35 Theme 1: Being an academic with disabilities

This subsection analyses disabled academic participants' social construction of employment including self-strategizing and self-negotiating methods adopted to 'normalise' disability at their University (Harlan and Robert, 1998, Roulstone, 2003, Foster, 2007). Furthermore, Gramscian theory on ideology and hegemony is applied to explain false conceptions about disabled academics' best interests (Sallach, 1974).

6.34 Theme 2: Employment promotion/progression

This theme drew on the themes in the literature that identify how disability affects employment promotion and progression (Caldwell et al., 2016) for disabled academics. As getting employment is the first barrier before disabled people can progress in employment, this subsection examines the University support provided towards academic employment promotion (Duffy and Dik, 2009).

6.35 Theme 3: Disability disclosure

Disability disclosure is a key theme in relation to disability in the workplace. Therefore, this subsection analyses disabled academic participants' disability disclosure process at their University, playing a key role in creating a socially-just and accessible workplace environment. It further investigates issues around the employment relationship of disabled academics being affected or unaffected at the University workplace.

6.36 Theme 4: Provision of help/support and reasonable adjustments

This subsection analyses disabled academic participants' input on the assistance provided by their Universities, because once the academic employee has declared their disability, it is then necessary to provide them with necessary support and reasonable adjustments (Foster, 2007).

6.37 Theme 5: Attitudes of employer/managers

This subsection analyses disabled academic participants' experiences at their University workplace, describing appropriate or inappropriate managerial and/or employer's response and their effects. This is important because positive or negative attitudes and behaviours of employers towards disabled academic employees encourage or discourage them from applying and remaining in employment.

6.38 Theme 6: Disability Policies and practices

This subsection analyses disabled academic participants' feedback on policies and practises, also their involvement in developing and maintaining workplace policies, which is crucial (Albrecht et al., 2001). Involvement is voluntary, but can be a rewarding experience (Meier and Stutzer, 2008). Involvement or detachment with disability equality issues is highlighted as problematic and resisted or welcomed (Imrie, 1997).

6.39 Theme 7: Training on disability awareness

This subsection analyses disabled academic participants' perceptions of disability awareness training and how far it removes embarrassment and discrimination (Gillespie-Sells and Campbell, 1991). It is examined within the Gramscian framework of replacing common-sense with good-sense (Gramsci, 1971c) in the context of creating a fairer environment, enabling disabled employees to participate to their fullest potential (Charles, 2005).

6.40 Theme 8: Stigmatizing and stereotyping of disability

This subsection analyses disabled academic participants' experiences of stigmatization and stereotyping (Stone and Colella, 1996), which led to positive and negative outcomes and consequences (Herman and Miall, 1990). This section also consists of suggestions and advice, on eradicating stigmatizing and stereotyping.

6.41 Ethics

When conducting any qualitative inquiry it is necessary to follow a code of ethics, taking appropriate ethical considerations into account (Flick, 2014). The nature of this research involved the study of a marginalised group with numerous ethical issues that required a lot of consideration. For this purpose, emphasis was placed on gaining informed consent, essentially to prevent harm to participants and the author (Josselson, 2007).

Firstly, this involved assurance that this research was conducted in adherence with the Queen Mary Research Ethics Committee requirements (see Appendix 3). Gaining informed consent meant providing adequate information about the research beforehand, so the participating sites and participants were able to make an informed decision to participate in this research (Crowe et al., 2011).

Secondly, the consent form together with an information sheet had already been emailed to all participants, to make them aware of the essentiality of consent. Before starting the interviews with participants, once again the research purposes were explained and a consent form was signed (see Appendix 4). The participants had the right to discontinue or withdrawn from the research at any time.

Thirdly, during the OH interview process it was ensured that none of the participants were emotionally harmed in the process (Williams et al., 2017). The author recognizes the emotional impact of the research, especially during the data collection and analysis process (Wolcott, 2002). When investigating emotional topics, researchers become 'vulnerable observers', by investigating experiences incorporating joys and horrors of their research participants (Behar, 2014: 1). Therefore, necessary steps need to be taken before embarking on such a research. As suggested by Gilbert (2000: 101), 'am I prepared to take on another's full humanity and to explore and unveil?'.

There were several participants who expressed grief and intense feelings and the author was mindful of any issues discussed that were distressing and refrained from pressurising the individual participant to disclose further information if they did not wish to. This was anticipated and appropriate responses discussed with the author's supervisor and also with the ethics committee at Queen Mary University of London beforehand. The author was instructed to guide the individual in

an appropriate manner towards supportive material, like websites and phone-lines both during the interview and post-interview via email, as the author is not a trained counsellor. Although no such risks were identified during the OH interviewing process, it was important that such safeguarding procedures were strategically designed to protect participants in any possible scenario. For this purpose, the author had already trained and prepared herself, to consult her supervisor, whenever she felt vulnerable. Thus, putting a procedure in place to ask for help whenever required (Mazzetti, 2018).

Fourthly, enormous care was taken while interpreting interview data to ensure that only necessary text for interpretation is used to clarify the point being made, because any further details might risk the anonymity of the University or any of the interview participants.

Lastly, having a research diary was a vital tool with therapeutic benefits, allowing the author to release her emotions and experiences in a safe environment (Furness and Garrud, 2010). Implementing such practises, protected the author from emotional harm. Furthermore, there was also potential that the disabled academic participants' narrative might negatively impact the analysis process. For this purpose, the author spent time reflecting on the stories that were told and maintained diary entries to ensure her interpretations were not desensitised.

6.42 Confidentiality and Consent: Getting Participant's Permission

Before conducting any semi-structured and OH interviews, consent was obtained through emailing and explaining the purpose of my research and informing participants about interview confidentiality, ensuring anonymity of individuals and Universities (Corbin and Morse, 2003, van den Hoonaard, 2003). Furthermore, it was also ensured that the biographical data or employment affiliations of the disabled academic participants as well as the employees from their University's HR department, was kept anonymous.

In addition, for the OH, strict individual consent that protects the anonymity of the participants, during and after their interviews was obtained. As with the three University case-studies, all of the participants are given pseudonyms. At 1UCS the participants from HR are *Grey*, *Richard* and *Felicity* and the disabled academics are *Joseph*, *Catherine* and *Nisha*. At 2UCS the participants from HR are *Andie*, *Bailey* and *Teresa* and the disabled academic participants are *Sydnie*, *Ann* and *Peter*. At 3UCS *Bamboos* was the only person to be interviewed from the HR department. This is because most of HR employees were too busy to be interviewed. The disabled academic participants at 3UCS are *Lawrence*, *Mandy*, *Suzie* and *Walt*.

The participants for the OH interviews were identified initially through University HR and through chain or snowball sampling, where existing participants recommend relevant acquaintances and

colleagues as future participants (Sadler et al., 2010). The consent and confidentiality forms have been added at the end of this PhD thesis (see appendix 4).

The disabled academic participants had different disabilities and taught/researched diverse academic subjects, summarised in the tables-below.

Table 6.2 disabled academic participants at 1UCS

Name of Disabled academic participants at 1UCS.	*Type of Impairment/Disability.*	*Academic-Subject.*	*OH interview time.*	*OH interview location.*
Joseph	Dyspraxia	Politics	3 hours	Staff-Room
Catharine	Stammer	Education	3 hours	Academic's office
Nisha	Vision and Spine	Sociology	3.5 hours	Staff-Room

Table 6.3 disabled academic participants at 2UCS

Name of Disabled academic participants at 2UCS.	*Type of Impairment/Disability.*	*Academic Subject.*	*OH interview time.*	*OH interview- location.*
Sydnie	Mental health	Researcher (Brain-injury)	2.5 hours	Personal-office
Ann	Spinal Injury	Nursing	3 hours	Staff-Room
Peter	Emotional instability	Researcher (Brain-injury)	4 hours	Academic's office

Table 6.4 disabled academic participants at 3UCS

Name of Disabled academic participants at 3UCS.	*Type of Impairment/Disability.*	*Academic Subject.*	*OH interview time.*	*OH interview location.*
Lawrence	Autism	Mathematics	3.5 hours	Academic's office
Mandy (PhD student)	Bipolar Disorder	Biology	1.5 hours	Staff-Room
Suzie	Multiple sclerosis MS	Sociology	3.5 hours	Academic's office
Walt	Deaf and Partially-blind	Zoology	4 hours	Academic's office

6.43 Conclusion

This Chapter discusses the research rationale for the methodological choices shaping this thesis and gives a detailed account of the research process. It incorporates a research design based on the

research map developed by Layder (1993). This allows the integration of the two main methodological choices, the case-study and the narrative inquiry approach. Furthermore, these methodological choices have permitted the use of particular research methods for the primary and secondary data collection. Application of such a methodology is advocated as the most appropriate approach towards understanding the perception towards disabled academics' employment and their experience and perception of academic employment within the University workplace.

The choice of using such a methodological approach has provided an important avenue to gather rich and sensitive data on disabled academics as the three University case-studies provide an interesting platform to explore the pervasive issues for disabled academics.

The author and the disabled academic participants are part of the same marginalized group. The author's academic life-experiences are similar to those of the participants, enabling data to be interpreted in a non-oppressive way. Therefore, the analysis begins in the next chapter with the presentation of the auto-ethnographic data, followed by a detailed analysis of the three University case-studies, through the data gathered by implementing the methodological approach put forward in this chapter.

7.0 Chapter Seven: An Auto-ethnography of a Disabled academic

7.1 Introduction

The purpose of this Chapter is to provide an auto-ethnographical review of the author's own struggle of becoming an academic and the political necessity of creating a barrier-free workplace for disabled academics. The objective is to discuss the author's disability experiences and the management of these experiences in order to complete her PhD research. For this reason, an auto-ethnographical approach has been adopted in this chapter, which is part of the methodology and analysis of this thesis.

7.2 Researching Myself

> "It was my PHD interview today, but I was late because the taxi driver took me to Queen Mary Hospital instead of Queen Mary University!" Nadia Ahmed, July, 2011.

As previous chapters have argued, disabled people have always been misrepresented in society, unable to get a proper education, get into employment and develop a career, making us victims of perceptions that we are being lazy and unwell. Similarly, we are sufferers of violence and depicted as benefit scroungers from the tax-payers (Marsh, 2011, Soorenian, 2012). It is only through great struggle and hardships, very few disabled people manage to gain access to HE and enter the Ivory Tower to develop an employment within academia (Barrett, 2010, Mattocks and Briscoe-palmer, 2016).

Regardless of being disabled, trying to secure employment within academia is not an easy task. The Ivory Tower has always been exclusive for those coming from a different race, gender or ethnic-origin (Muzzatti and Samarco, 2005, Siegelman, 2014, Shelby-Caffey et al., 2015). This is because no matter how protective the legislation is towards minorities, there is always a reason for not hiring or dismissing, or failing to promote, or denying a pay raise (Edelman et al., 2001). Although, the EqA provides a framework of protection for disabled academics in the UK, including the provision of 'reasonable adjustments' to make the workplace-accessible, the Ivory Tower resists the employment of disabled academics (HESA, 2013, HESA, 2016).

Disabled students who manage to become academics are oppressed in different ways, indicating further marginalization of disability within academia (Williams, 2011). According to Broadfoot and Munshi (2007: 256) 'The ivory tower is (not) of reason, rationality, and rigid structures colonizes the (academic) world". It is not only a socio-cultural inaccessible structure, but as the name states 'Ivory Tower' suggests a physically inaccessible place (Shakespeare, 1998). It represents a physically and metaphorically tall, inaccessible building just for the able-bodied, high above the masses just for the elite, made of a rare and valuable material that only a few, very wealthy people could afford. One

has to be a man to climb it to the top, and suggests the Ivory Tower is white in more ways than one way.

An auto-ethnographical approach seeks 'to describe and systematically analyse (graphy) personal-experience (auto), in order to understand cultural and social experience' (Ellis et al., 2010a: 1). Therefore, I am self-reflecting on the process of doing research and my quest to make visible the barriers faced by disabled academics (Neville-Jan, 2004). Simultaneously, as a disabled researcher, I am also collecting experiences, in the form of story-telling interviews of other disabled academics, which is a 'good-practice' in doing critical-fieldwork (Brewer, 2000: 130). So, I am comparing and investigating my own and experiences of others (Couser, 2005). Consequently, this Chapter is an essential part of my PhD thesis data-collection and findings.

I shall be using the 'first-person' to tell this auto-ethnography in order to share my own lived experiences 'through an interaction and participation in an intimate and immediate eyewitness account' (Ellis et al., 2010b: 4). Through this auto-ethnography, I shall be investigating attempts to accomplish a PhD degree, and how training and getting employment as an academic remains difficult for disabled people (Oliver and Barnes, 1997c, Jacobs, 2010).

7.3 My Introduction

My narrative as a storyteller situates me having a degenerative condition, known as Friedreich's Ataxia making me a permanent wheelchair-user, struggling to achieve an employment within academia (Bochner, 2001). My example is grounded in similar conditions specific to any disabled academic, the cultural setting in which I live and work. Hopefully, my 'findings will empower other researchers who face various obstacles in their own research practice' (Polczyk, 2012: 1). Therefore, my position as a research participant and a researcher, involves a story that is self-reflexive, examining my values and preconceptions (Neville-Jan, 2004: 114). Thus, providing a link between my autobiographical-self and my research practices (Reed-Danahay, 1997b).

7.4 Understanding my Auto-ethnography

I am passionate about doing research with disabled people because I am disabled-myself. Although, my PhD research focus is on the employment barriers experienced by disabled academics, in this chapter I am writing about living my own transition of becoming a disabled academic (Boylorn, 2006) and the generalized disability barriers. While, writing this Chapter the use of language is very personal and emotional, which might seem inappropriate (Atkinson, 1997). However, it allows me to locate myself in a cultural context, documenting my lived-experiences (Ellis and Bochner, 2000, Richards, 2008).

7.5 A Taste of Auto-ethnography

In May 2013 I attended a conference in Canada, which was on developing and managing research-methodologies. There I was introduced to auto-ethnography by Professor Päivi Eriksson from the University of Eastern Finland. It was through her workshop on auto-ethnography, I learnt that research data can be collected through one's own experiences and that knowledge collection can be accomplished by a 'state-of-being (energetic, depressed), or event (for example, change of jobs) and in relation to a certain cultural context' (Eriksson, 2013: 6).

Initially my plan was to use a traditional writing style with typical methods of qualitative research (Denzin, 2006) drawing on scholarly literature and semi-structured interviewing of disabled academics and universities' HR managers. However, I realized that this was not sufficient, as my own experiences of being a disabled researcher were becoming inseparable from the research process. This made me wonder how would a traditional academic writing style with an intellectual research design and an analytic orientation, justify the expression of my personal experiences (Sandberg and H.Tsoukas, 2011)? So, I choose auto-ethnography as part of my research methodology and analysis findings and writing style, satisfying and justifying the purpose of my research (Eriksson, 2013) influenced by feminist and practice-based theory (Tsoukas and Knudsen, 2003).

The main idea of using an auto-ethnographic writing style is to incorporate self-reflection to understand multicultural others, qualitative inquiry, and narrative writing (Chang, 2008). Although it is an intimidating-process, it can become an inspiring research work for others (Ellis and Bochner, 2000) since I am making my private and academic life public and being true to the battle-cry of disability research: 'nothing about us, without us' (Yeo and Moore, 2003: title, Morris, 1991a). This means, describing emotionality, political aspects and ethical considerations, thus making me a 'vulnerable author' (Ellis and Bochner, 2006: 440).

7.6 Mythical Assumptions and a Shaky Start

On 21st June 2011 at 4 o'clock, I was invited at Queen Mary University of London for a PhD interview, I was very excited about it, but also anxious. Undergoing a PhD for me as a disabled person seemed like a mission-impossible. I had already booked a wheelchair accessible taxi a day in advance to go to the University. The next day the taxi arrived on time and the driver seemed to be a smart English middle-aged man. I was new in London and not familiar with the roads, therefore I was unable to know if the taxi driver was heading in the right direction. The taxi-driver kept asking me if I was late for an appointment. In response I said I have to be there exactly at 4 o'clock. After an hour's travel the taxi stopped in front of a huge hospital building saying 'Queen Mary Hospital'.

"Oh no, I'm not supposed to be here and it's 4 o'clock!". I said to the taxi driver that I have to be at Queen Mary University and not at the hospital. The taxi-driver replied in his Cockney accent, "I

thought yew need ter go ter a 'ospital appointmun'". Why is it thought in society that disabled people always end up in hospitals and are not expected to have a healthy social life, good education and career? (Barnes, 1997b). I didn't know what to do; worried I called up the University and after speaking to many people, I got through to my (potential) supervisor Professor Hazel Conley. Nervously, I blurted out the entire story, sounding like a child complaining, I was so sure I would be rejected as a PhD candidate. However, I hear this comforting voice assuring me that I should not worry as I'll be waiting at the University for you. I was then told to give the phone to the taxi-driver so he could be explained the University address. Arriving late for my PhD interview was certainly not a good start, but after meeting my (potential) supervisor it was explained that London is still working towards a barrier free environment for disabled people. This is precisely, what I should do my PhD-research on, I thought, because I am struggling to achieve employment as a disabled person in London, one of the richest capital cities in the world. Of course, the focus of my research narrowed down to disabled academic employees, but the core has always been on being disabled in an able-bodied dominated world. This was the first barrier I experienced during my transition of becoming a disabled academic.

7.7 My ethnography – Situating Myself

As a disabled person suffering from a degenerative neurological disorder my health condition deteriorates with time and I can no longer walk, relying on the use of a power-wheelchair. I am also a Muslim woman with an Asian ethnic origin, meaning that I have multiple social-political identities relating in a mutual and essential manner (Baca and Thornton, 1996). So, my social-political identities (gender, race, belief, ethnicity and disability) fuse together to form different meanings and experiences. Thus, my multiple identities interact with each other, creating specific manifestations (Warner, 2008). However, in this PhD thesis, my focus is only on disabled academics employed at English Universities, because, there are very few academics with disabilities, regardless of their gender, race, belief and ethnicity (Williams and Mavin, 2015).

It has been a year since I began living in a wheelchair accessible apartment a stone's throw away from my University, where I am doing my PhD research. I got this apartment after great struggle. Before this, I lived for two years unofficially in the University halls of residence. I had to justify my extended stay to the University and make continuous complaints to the local council about how I was unable to find any wheelchair accommodation near my University where I was doing my PhD research. Ironically, at the time of my struggle, just down the road in Stratford the government was spending billions of pounds on the construction of the Olympic stadium with state-of-the-art facilities for the Paralympians. Luckily, due to the Olympics and Paralympics coming to London, I had a crucially valid case to fight for and I succeeded in gaining adapted accommodation, which I expand upon below.

My current apartment is on the second floor, although, there are two lifts in the building, they are occasionally broken, which means I am unable to attend doctor's appointments, conferences, lectures, meetings, etc. (Oliver, 1996b). There have been times when I have been trapped outside my apartment because of the broken lift, hence spending the night or the weekend at the University PhD office. Unlike most people I cannot go to a friend's house as their place is not wheelchair accessible (Goldstein and Johnson, 1997). These occurrences are not simply annoying glitches for me; such circumstances mean my limited amount of independence is lost. They entail cancelling and rescheduling my carers who help me with most of my daily duties, like eating, dressing, hygiene and preparatory tasks related to work (Morris, 2014).

This also affects my PhD research, for example, once I had to attend a lecture at the University, but was unable to go due to broken lifts (Burchardt, 2005). Problems of finding and maintaining the kind of daily essentials most non-disabled people take for granted, are just some of the many barriers I face as a disabled person and researcher. However, once I have reached the University PhD office my workspace is established, I work independently. Considering these issues is ethically and legally correct and also makes good business sense (Scott-Parker and Zadek, 2001a) by attracting potential disabled PhD researchers.

7.8 Beginnings of a Disabled researcher and an Activist

In October 2011 I officially started my PhD program; everyone in the department was extremely welcoming. However, when encountering non-disabled people for the first-time, I felt they were over-compensating, because I am a disabled PhD academic. This could be due to the fact that I am our department's first disabled wheelchair-user PhD academic, which made people uncertain and uncomfortable (Oliver, 1984).

I discovered that at my University there were many under-graduate disabled students. I would see them during the day going to their classes but would never see them at any social events organized by the University's Students' Union (SU). I soon discovered that the University SU was in desperate need of a society to raise disability awareness. This provided me with the opportunity to become an activist and to start a society, also benefiting my PhD research. Instead of calling it a society for disabled students, it was named 'Ability Society'. I did not want to label it to specific type of students, creating a further stereotype at our University (Green et al., 2005). Surprisingly, lots of disabled and non-disabled students signed up for Ability Society. I also managed to host many social events and meetings. After a year's enlightening experience, I had to hand-over the reins of Ability Society, due to the workload of my PhD.

In the beginning I found PhD research rather overwhelming. English is not my first language so I struggled to understand academic readings and writings. In addition, I found it difficult to relate to

theories suggested by scholars I was reading and then connecting it to disability. My supervisor recommended that I should get into the habit of regularly reading academic papers published in journals, making it easier for me to read, understand and write academically. She also suggested that, I should not fear to be curious and ask questions because there is no such thing as silly questions. For example, I struggled to understand in what sense the word 'emancipation' was used in relation to 'disability'. My supervisor suggested a few articles to read, which I did, and only after reading these, I could then understand the meaning of 'emancipation' in relation to disability. As I grew more confident in reading and conceptualising disability in the light of other theorists, my academic writing also developed. This led to an opportunity to get a paper published in a renowned journal '*Disability & Society*' (Ahmed, 2013).

7.9 First Publication: An Emancipating Experience

My first publication was about accessible-housing for disabled people during the 2012 London Olympics and Paralympics. It was the intention of the Olympic Legacy to provide thousands of new homes to disabled people in London, where the Paralympic athletes were accommodated during the games (Peck, 2012). Therefore, raising hopes about improving the housing situation for disabled people and trying to change attitudes towards disabled people by engendering the successes of disabled athletes. However, this never fully materialised (Roulstone, 2012b).

I submitted my paper to the journal in October 2012, my first academic article was published in January 2013. Submission of this paper created a stir and was instrumental in improving my own housing dilemma. Soon I received a letter from the local council, apologising for the delay, offering me wheelchair accessible accommodation by September 2013. On the 7th of September 2013 after much struggle, patience and sacrifice I was rehoused in a fully wheelchair-accessible, one-bedroom flat located near my University, where I was undertaking my PhD research.

This episode in my life during my PhD research illustrates the links between academia and activism. Firstly, understanding the theories and concepts of emancipation as it relates to disability studies in academia. Second, giving me an opportunity, (as an activist) to recognise the irony and injustice towards disability. Thus, I was able to publish a paper which was academically and politically informed, creating awareness in society. Personally, highlighting the importance of academia and activism is something I am determined to extend in the future through research.

7.10 The PhD Progression, an Achievement!

4pm on the 23rd of January 2013 marked my PhD Progression, an examination process after 12 months of my PhD registration. This is a compulsory examination process, feared by all PhD academics, which entailed submitting a progression document containing a summary of my PhD research, along with a presentation that I had to defend during a *viva voce.* In order to proceed on to

the second year of my PhD, I had to pass this examination. Although, I did pass the progression, it was problematic for the examiners in the Progression Panel to empathise with a disabled person doing a PhD. For example, there seemed to be some concern that I would be unsafe while doing fieldwork, which includes traveling to other cities and conducting face-to-face interviews. Instead, of encouraging me to do research and advising me on facing potential-barriers, I felt the barriers were being inflated by the Progression Panel.

My research focuses on disabled academics employed at English-Universities, however, the examiners did not expect me to be conducting fieldwork outside of London, assuming, disabled academics are more 'vulnerable' than non-disabled academics. I found this particularly ironic, because I travel to Pakistan every year to meet my family. This process made me feel disempowered and underestimated by examiners. However, I also felt empowered because I was the only disabled researcher in the room, having direct and personal knowledge of doing research with a disability (Jacobs, 2010). Undoubtedly, the Progression Panel and the examiners were unaware about what it is like to do fieldwork in a wheelchair.

7.11 Navigating the Welfare-State

At the outset of my PhD registration I had to go through the process of declaring myself as a disabled PhD student. Following the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act, I assumed that this would be a straightforward process. Every disabled student in England is entitled to a pot of money called Disabled Students' Allowance (DSA), awarded by the government, known as Student Finance England (SFE). This allowance covers extra disability related costs or expenses while studying, including specialist equipment allowance (example; typing, speaking and other types of software, and other expenditure allowance (books and photocopying) and carer's/helper's travel costs (DSA, 2014).

However, this was not a straightforward-process, making me realise that the DSA is designed for undergraduate disabled students and not postgraduate disabled PhD researchers. Possibly, because it is assumed that, disabled people will not study further than an undergraduate degree (Beauchamp-Pryor, 2007). Similar to my experience in relation to my PhD progression, it was very difficult to make SFE understand that I, a physically disabled wheelchair bound person, am doing a PhD, which involves outdoor fieldwork, like interviewing, presenting and attending conferences all over the world, just like all the other PhD researchers.

For example, in May 2013 I attended my first international conference in France, at the Université Paris Dauphine. It was a workshop conference on research advances in organizational behaviour and HR management, extremely beneficial for my research. I had submitted a paper about my research methodology to be presented at the conference. I was sure that it would get rejected, as I was still at

an early stage in my PhD. Surprisingly, it was accepted and I was invited to present my work, meaning I could get critical feedback by internationally renowned academics. I had enough PhD funds for my travel and accommodation in France for three days, but due to my disability I needed a non-medical helper to accompany me. This meant buying an extra ticket, so I decided to use my DSA. Expecting a simple procedure, I contacted my University Disability Advisor (UDA).

After explaining my travel to France to the UDA I was assured that they simply need to contact the SFE for their permission to fund my non-medical helper. However, the process turned out to be very complicated and problematic. At first the SFE blindly rejected my request and told me to fund my non-medical helper the way I would do when I am going on holiday. This made no sense and in response my UDA explained that I was not going on holiday, but attending a conference concerning my PhD. They replied that if I was presenting at the conference I should ask the conference organisers to fund my non-medical helper, as they would only give funds if I was going as a listener. Now I was really worried as I had already booked travel and accommodation for myself, but it was looking as though I would not be able to go because of my disability.

After some protracted discussions between my UDA and SFE, it became clear that SFE did not understand how a PhD is done. This is because they had never encountered disabled students doing a PhD. However, SFE were willing to concede, that if I wrote to them explaining my attendance at the conference along with my supervisor's approval they might consider my request. I then structured an email explaining SFE the reason and necessity for attending and presenting at this conference. With my supervisor's approval I then asked my UDA to send it to SFE. After much delay SFE agreed to fund my non-medical helper's ticket to France. Once, I arrived at the Université Paris Dauphine for the conference everything was accessible. My paper presentation went smoothly and I got productive feedback. I also got the opportunity to meet other PhD academics from around the world, an important process for professional development (Ventola et al., 2002).

Dealing with the SFE was just one of the hurdles towards international traveling as a disabled researcher (Oliver and Barnes, 1997c). Although we are living in the 21st century with advanced technologies that amaze and astound us, we still fail to accommodate disabled people. The welfare state claims to acknowledge the social model in its legislation (HL, 2016). However, my experience with SFE, which is a government organisation, highlights a limited approach towards the aspirations and capabilities of disabled researchers.

7.12 Hurdles of Getting Ethical Approval

Before initiating any empirical research fieldwork, ethics approval is crucial, in order to ensure that the research participants and the researcher themselves are safe, protected and abide to the University regulations and good practice during research fieldwork (Jamrozik, 2004). At our

University any research involving human participants may give rise to ethical risks and it is essential that researchers manage these risks effectively. To ensure high ethical standards are maintained in the research carried out, an ethical approval is required before commencing any research.

In my case it took approximately six months to get approval for my research, delaying my fieldwork. Part of the delay was, in my view, due to lack of disability awareness. In November 2013, I submitted my ethics document to the University's Ethics Committee (UEC). This was an opportunity for me to begin writing my PhD methodology chapter. I assumed that this process would take a few weeks, as my methodology had already been approved in my progression. The first submission to the UEC was a lengthy process. I was asked to make many corrections, in part, due to confusions in understanding research done by a disabled researcher (Oliver and Barnes, 1997c). For example, although, I explained that I would recruit academics for my research interviews having various self-declared visible and non-visible disabilities, I was asked to give a definition of what I meant by 'disabled' in my research. This confusion arose partly because the title of my research incorporates the words 'wheelchair-accessible' and I am also a wheelchair-user. There was an assumption that I am only researching disabled academics that use wheelchairs. However, this was not the case and I explained that the 'wheelchair accessible' universal blue wheelchair symbol has a wider disability accessibility meaning. Therefore, indicating various disabilities and not just focusing only on wheelchair users as my research participants. This was a learning experience for me in understanding the way non-disabled people interpret disability symbolism.

One of the major debates was whether I needed to submit a risk assessment form along with my ethics document. Researchers at our University submit a risk assessment form if they are conducting research overseas or in people's homes. This is because they might be more vulnerable than if they were doing research within their University. Since, I was intending to do neither of these as part of my research I was surprised that I was asked to fill out a risk assessment. It was once again clear, that being disabled, I was also considered to be vulnerable. I was therefore, required to ensure that I kept in regular contact with my supervisors, during my fieldwork so that, someone would be aware of my location at all times, in case I encountered accessibility difficulties while travelling or on other university premises. In response, I reiterated that my fieldwork entails visiting other English Universities where disabled academics and students work and study on a day-to-day basis and are required by law to make their premises wheelchair accessible. My University department is on the fourth floor and there is an accessible lift to go upstairs and down stairs, but often the lift is out-of-order. Therefore, these are problems and risks that I take every time I come to my own University. Indeed, encountering these issues in my own and other universities is part of my research especially for this auto-ethnography.

Instead, the UEC approached the risk assessment issue from another angle, arguing that I might be asked by the participant to carry out the interview in their home, requiring a risk assessment. This argument was based on the assumption that disabled academics work largely from home, which is not supported by my own experience or research to date (Grove, 2016). Disabled academics, like able-bodied academics, have their own offices at their university premises, where I could visit discreetly and confidentially at convenient times.

A large part of my research is about the university environment for disabled academics, meaning interviewing them in their workplace. Since there is no policy of asking PhD researchers in my University Department to complete a risk assessment, if their fieldwork is taking place within the UK, asking me to complete a risk assessment was anomalous. Once this was understood by the UEC, I was no longer required to complete a risk assessment but getting to this point took the longest effort, time and considerably delayed my fieldwork.

7.13 In-accessibilities during fieldwork

As soon as I was granted the ethical approval for my research, which was on the 1st of May 2014, I had to proceed on to my fieldwork, investigating the case-study universities and disabled academics via interviews. Fortunately, since no ethical approval is required for making access arrangements, I had already contacted the disabled academics and the HR department of the three University case-studies. This was done through university websites and online network forums.

After gaining my ethics approval, I then sent interview invites to the three University case-studies. Fortunately, I acquired approval to conduct case-study research in all three Universities considerably quickly. After much discussion and consultation with my supervisor, it was decided that I should begin my fieldwork from the nearest located University, (close to where I live, so if I forgot something I could easily go back and get it). I realised this was something that I would need to think about carefully when doing my distant case-studies.

My first interview was with the manager of the HR department of the first University case study (1UCS). I was invited to the person's office for the interview. I arrived at the office building early to ensure I was not late for the interview appointment. On arrival, I saw the building was of Victorian architecture, but surely it must be wheelchair-accessible, as I confirmed accessibility beforehand. The building had a stair-lift at the entrance for me to enter the building but the stair-lift was out-of-order. Now I started to panic as I would be late for the interview appointment. I asked the receptionist to inform the HR manager that I would be unable to go up to the office as the stair-lift was broken. Soon I received a message that the manager was coming downstairs and we would go together to an accessible building. A lot of time was wasted, but the manager acknowledged this and gave me extra time for the interview.

For another interview meeting with another HR manager, I had carefully arranged a mutually convenient time and date, but this HR managers did not show-up. Instead, they left a message apologising that, "I'll be unable to attend and we should reschedule". This was annoying for me, because coming to 1UCS early morning via public transport was not an easy mission. The interview appointment was rescheduled for the following week and the interviewee gave me lots of important information on disability equality policies and training at 1UCS.

After conducting interviews with the HR department, I then had to interview the disabled academics at 1UCS. For this purpose, I used the OH interviewing technique, allowing me to collect past and present information from participants about events, peoples' behaviours, decisions and processes (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2010).

My OH interviews took approximately four hours each with breaks in the middle. I thoroughly, enjoyed doing this part of the fieldwork, although, it was a lengthy and exhausting process. I was able to empathize and understand their experiences of barriers towards career progression as a disabled academic. Using OH interviewing techniques for ethnographic purposes, supports the view that 'auto-ethnography as a method is both a process and product' (Ellis et al., 2010a: 1).

Through my fieldwork on 1UCS I discovered that some of the required information on disability was not properly published on their university website (EHRC, 2010b). According to the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), equality of information in public sector organisations should be published and accessible to everybody (ECU, 2011b). I informed the HR at 1UCS about this, resulting in information being correctly published, thus demonstrating the impact of research and a plausible act of activism, as part of my research activities (Webster, 2014).

7.14 Hawaiian Paradise

From December 2013 onwards, while I was waiting for my research ethics approval, I submitted an abstract for a presentation at the disability studies conference at the University of Hawaii. Attending and presenting at conferences helped me develop my knowledge, giving me an opportunity to network, an essential tool for academic development (Rowley-Jolivet, 2002). My conference attendance meant considering the cost, time and most importantly my mobility limitations. Therefore, I shall only attend conferences where my abstract submission has been accepted and I am invited to do a presentation. For this purpose, I chose the 'Pacific-Rim International Conference on Disability and Diversity' which was in May 2014 in Hawaii.

This conference was one of the few that focussed specifically on disability E&D policies and practises in society. My presentation examined disability EDI rights, based on achieving justice and equality for disabled employees. At the time of the abstract submission, I was doubtful if my abstract would get

approved, because as my focus was on disabled employees and the workplace, whereas, the conference focus was on society and not just on the workplace. This is one of the largest conferences in the World on disability studies and I received an invite to attend the conference; my abstract for this conference was accepted and I was over the moon! Now the challenge was the availability of funds for wheelchair travel and accommodation arrangements in Hawaii.

At first, I was convinced that my DSA would pay for my carer's accommodation and travel, and I could use my PhD funds for myself. However, once again SFE were unable to accept that it is usual for non-disabled PhD researchers to attend international academic conferences, if their funding permitted it. The UDA tried explaining once again by giving examples of my previous academic conference trips to France and Canada. Instead SFE rigidly refused to acknowledge and understand reasons for my attendance at a disability conference in Hawaii with a carer. It seems that the idea of an independent disabled researcher will always remain a myth (Barnes, 1996)!

Fortunately, one of my colleagues told me that I could apply for the Post-Graduate Research Funds (PGRF) awarded by my University. This was my only hope, as the conference was in the end of May and I still needed extra funds to book my carer's travel flight ticket and accommodation. Simultaneously, I challenged SFE's response to the DSA refusal towards funding my carer's travel and accommodation by sending a formal appeal letter. This letter contained the entire story of how I felt discriminated against as a result of my disability. The letter of acknowledgement was received saying that my case would be investigated and a response would be made available in two to three-weeks. Due to time shortage I could not wait for the SFE's reply. Instead, I submitted the PGRF application, my supervisor also agreed to this decision.

On the 4th of April the PGRF agreed to award the requested funds towards my travel and my carer's travel, which meant I could save on my PhD funds. I gladly accepted the funds awarded through the PGRF and booked the flight tickets and accommodation for the conference in Hawaii. Soon, after all the necessary arrangements were made, I received a response from SFE apologising for their misunderstanding and agreed to fund my carer. Their apologies were useless as the funding was all sorted through the PGRF. However, they assured me that when I apply for DSA for my next conference trip I will not experience such a situation again. The travel to Hawaii from London (UK) was very long, fourteen hours flight to Hawaii with a three hours stop-over in Seattle (USA). The journey was exhausting but worth it.

My presentation was at 10 o'clock in the morning on the first-day of the conference. There was a large number of people in the audience waiting for my presentation to begin. After a successful presentation, Q&A-session and receiving positive comments from the audience, I was now relaxed and able to attend other workshops and presentations at the conference. This gave me an

opportunity to build up my network, as I met many renowned academics, activists and other researchers from around the world. During the conference a woman introduced herself to me as the editor of a journal 'Review of Disability Studies' (RDS) produced by the University of Hawaii. She suggested, that my presentation on 'disabled-employees' was an important topic and offered me an opportunity to publish my paper in RDS.

7.15 Other Problematic Issues

On arriving back to London, I quickly got back to working on my PhD research. I updated my notes about my experiences as a disabled researcher at the conference. This was for my 'research diary' which plays an important role in creating auto-ethnography (Wall, 2008). Shortly after my arrival, I received an email inviting me to present at an E&D conference being held in Germany at the Technische Universität München. Fortunately, I already had my previous presentation, but for this conference I wanted to change it and make it compatible with the statistics based on the population of disabled employees. I gladly accepted this opportunity and started preparing for my voyage.

This time my conference travel was all sorted and my carer's travel-expenses were all being funded by SFE through my DSA. However, I was unable to find a carer to travel with me to Germany for three days. Germany was clearly not as attractive an option as Hawaii! At the last minute, I managed to convince a friend to accompany me. However, the travel tickets had become so expensive that even my DSA was not enough to pay for the trip and therefore, at the last minute, I was unable to go. This led to an online Skype presentation at the conference, which was a very dull-experience. Although, I received a lot of questions and comments from the audience, I was unable to attend presentations done by others or to meet conference attendees (Ahmed, 2014).

7.16 Disability accessibility and teaching

April, May and June are the months of examination for under-graduate and Master's students at the University. This is a great opportunity for the PhD academics to earn extra money invigilating the examination process. When I was in my first and second year I got lots of opportunities to invigilate. I was asked, specifically to invigilate the exams for disabled students, who need extra exam time. I was pleased to undertake these duties, because through these academic practises our department was creating disability awareness (Barnes, 1996).

After my second year, I became concerned that I was no longer asked to invigilate. Having a disabled invigilator meant extra work and time in making the examination room accessible. I discovered this when someone from the administration came to our PhD room looking for potential invigilators. The person sounded desperate, asking if anyone is willing to invigilate on that day. No one but me was available. However, I was told "We'll have to move the desks and change the arrangement of the room to make it accessible for you. But not to worry, if we don't find anyone we'll ask you to do the

invigilation". I was not asked to do the invigilation and felt excluded from the opportunities provided to other PhD colleagues.

I am also facing similar troubles with gaining experience of any teaching (Oliver, 1984). Part of the PhD process consists of the experience of teaching under-graduates and Master's students. All of my PhD colleagues were offered seminars to teach on a weekly basis. Unfortunately, I never got the opportunity, making me consider whether my teaching abilities were being underestimated, because of being disabled. As Oliver and Barnes (1997c: 812) have argued, 'One of the key features of a disabling society is that disabled workers are expected to perform like super-cripples in order to hold down a job'. Fortunately, my supervisor recognized this issue and suggested that I should shadow her lectures, while she teaches, like an apprenticeship, I can then mention shadowing teaching experience on my CV.

7.17 Fieldwork Hiccups

After the successful completion of interviews and documentary research at 1UCS, I moved on to the second University's fieldwork. The previous year this University was willing to participate in my research. Although, I had informed them that, because I was conducting my research part-time and I was yet to gain ethics-approval, I would not start my fieldwork until the following year, which at the time they accepted. However, following a change of personnel, the new HR director refused to participate in the research giving the long-time delay, between the predecessor's acceptance and the commencement of the fieldwork as the reason.

7.18 Keep Calm and Carry on!

As a disabled academic, I had already prepared myself for such setbacks. So, without wasting any time I started working on my Second University case-study (2CSU), which was originally to be the third University case-study. I had already contacted them and they were still willing to participate in my research. This university is outside London and required a trip away and finding a carer was again difficult. After interviewing many carers for two days, one of them agreed to accompany me. This process elongated the time scale of my fieldwork and is clearly a major issue in the social reality I observe and experience as a disabled academic (Reed-Danahay, 1997c).

On the 25th of November 2014 I travelled North to do my second University case-study. I was nervous, worrying if I had forgotten important things like extra batteries for my voice-recorder or/and copies of interviewee's consent forms. Simultaneously, I was equally excited about the interviews. This fieldwork trip was very hectic, four weekdays with interviews already arranged in a tight schedule to complete them in the carefully planned field trip. Once again, SFE funded my carer's travel and accommodation, this time without any fuss!

My carer and I took the train from London; it was a three hour-journey. Surprisingly, the City was small and accessible, useful for a disabled researcher. The University's architectural design was very smart. All of the buildings had been joined together, so from whichever building one enters they are inside the University. This was done to gain protection from the unpredictable English weather. Inside the University there was a web of colour-coded ramps, flying from one side to the other and having lifts on each level. Everything is appropriately signed and colour-coded, so it is easy to navigate the University premises.

On the day of my arrival, I already had booked interview appointments with the HR managers. The interviews went smoothly and I got lots of information about 2UCS, which I will further discuss in my analysis Chapter Nine. Just as I was impressed by the physical university architecture, I was also impressed by the practices towards disabled employees. I completed insightful and exciting OH interviews with disabled academics from different departments over the remaining three days of my fieldwork. I was unable to interview one disabled academic as the person was ill. The disabled academic agreed to do a telephone interview which was a very unusual experience, but I managed to gather some valuable information (Sturges and Hanrahan, 2004).

7.19 Last University Case-study

My third and last university case-study (3UCS) was the most challenging one of my PhD research, as it was the last-minute replacement for the earlier withdrawal of a similar case-study. Following intense negotiations, I gained access to interview the HR team and the disabled academics. Firstly, I had no prior contacts at 3CSU, so I just went on the University website and emailed the HR department. I did not receive a successful response straightway; instead I received many automated email replies. The responses I did receive from people informed me that their department only deals with disabled students and not staff/employees. However, they agreed to forward my email to the relevant departments.

After an anxious wait I received a very discouraging email from the HR department. Stating, although my research is very interesting, due to workload, 3UCS would be unable to participate. However, if I did manage to contact this HR manager, s/he would be able to assist me further. I then emailed the E&D officer, but I did not receive an email response. Depressed and feeling defeated, one of my colleagues recommended that I should just call them to find out for sure if they would participate in the interviews. Telephone discussions are difficult for me and I feel nervous when speaking to unknown people on the phone. However, building up my courage I decided to call the HR manager.

Surprisingly, the very first attempt got me through to the HR manager. Trying to sound confident I introduced myself. The person was very polite, but in a rush, which meant I had to be able to deliver my message in a short and simple manner. This was a difficult task for me; however, it was

accomplished successfully. I realized this on the next day, when I received a call from the same person, requesting me to email my research information, interview-invite and the letter that confirms my ethics approval for my research. I have never received an email response from an HR manager; instead, I always had to call to get a response. This was not physically easy for me at all as a disabled researcher (Shah, 2006). However, I was desperate to gain access at 3UCS so I had to continue communicating, via telephone calls.

The 3UCS website gave details of the Disabled Staff Network (DSN), which I tried gaining access to electronically. Instead, I was directed to the Disabled Staff Officer (DSO), who informed me that only the University staff are allowed access to the DSN. I then explained the reason of accessing the DSN, was to send out an invite to all disabled academics to participate in my PhD research interview. The DSO agreed to help me with sending out invites. I also took the opportunity to ask the DSO to participate in my interview who, fortunately, agreed to be interviewed.

After a week's wait, I only received one response from a disabled academic, informing me that they would like to participate in my interview research. I was surprised and disappointed because the 3UCS website shows that there are many disabled academic employees, assuming that many disabled academics would like to participate.

So, I decided to contact the director of every department (via email) to get permission to interview the disabled academics of their department. 3UCS has 150 departments, each department is divided into three or four smaller sub-departments and each sub-department has more than one Director/Head. I rose to the challenge, sent 200 personalised emails to each department Director/Head. Typing is difficult for me, so the process was very time-consuming, exhausting and it took me two weeks, but the mission was accomplished. I received lots of nasty emails from academics telling me that disability research was a waste of time. However, many disabled academics from various departments agreed to be part of my research interviews, making me wonder about the effectiveness of the official advertised staff disability network.

7.20 Discussions on this Auto-ethnography

In this Chapter, I have shared my personal academic experiences, my day-to-day barriers and challenges I encounter in relation to the socio-cultural-conditions where research is conducted and located. To prevent my story (auto-ethnography) from becoming just another-story, I have a theoretical and methodological framework and a research literature to support my auto-ethnography (Ellis et al., 2010b). Furthermore, I take this process of auto-ethnography one step forward, by analytically comparing my own experiences with the socio-political behaviours of other able-bodied-agencies (Couser, 2005). Therefore, attention has been drawn to some of the personal, but not entirely unique to me, disability related difficulties encountered during my research, giving

rise to a number of conflicting issues, which were uncovered by the recurring matters arising during the process of writing this auto-ethnography. These experiences/difficulties are inextricably linked to the fact that I am living with a disability and undertaking social research in an able-bodied society. I have identified the four most significant conflicting issues, which are as follows:

7.21 Inadequate Bureaucratic Procedures

During each stage of my research, there were many problematic procedures that were unable to manage exceptional disability circumstances. Although, bureaucratic policies and procedures are accustomed in catering for disabled people as the social model is followed, this does not fully take into account disability in practice (Brown and Boardman, 2010). This highlights the limitations of liberal approaches to equality, where everybody is given equal opportunities, regardless of having a disability (Woodhams and Danieli, 2000), discussed in Chapter Four.

For example, the ethics approval committee failed to understand that a disabled PhD researcher would be travelling to other cities in order to do fieldwork. Thus, supporting the idea of being inflexible and undermining a disabled academic's abilities.

7.22 Funding of Finances

The need for more research funding is always required to enable me to be treated equally (Mercer, 2002). For example, SFE was unable to understand the idea of a disabled person doing a fieldwork-based PhD research, which involves attending international conferences. Demonstrating the historic disability stigma influencing academia, also discussed in the literature in Chapter Two. This again contributes to the idea of low performance expectations and reinforcing that disabled academics are unable to progress in academic employment. Funding bodies should be sensitive towards the needs and requirements of disabled researchers. They must recognise that these are legitimate considerations towards disabled academics when awarding any type of research funding (Oliver and Barnes, 1997c: 813).

7.23 Understanding of Gatekeepers

I experienced a lack of disability awareness among gatekeepers at every stage of my research. I had to battle to convey my needs and requirements to various funding bodies or when contacting people for organizing potential interview participants. These gatekeepers had very problematic views towards decision-making, having never experienced being disabled (Andrews, 2005). For example, one of the university case-studies had promised to introduce me to potential interview participants, within the university. However, let me

down by failing to provide any participants without a valid reason, causing last minute cancellations which are difficult to rearrange for me.

7.24 Underestimating Capabilities of Academic Employment

A disabled academic can be easily ignored by colleagues when dealing with gaining employment experiences, like teaching, marking-exams and assignments (Roulstone, 2012a). Therefore, questioning the importance of disabled academics in academia and the proper-application of the social model is important.

7.25 Conclusion

The above conflicting issues have been developed through self-participation, i.e. the process of gathering, analysing and interpreting my own experiences. This helps me to demonstrate outcomes and barriers experienced by other disabled academics and the able-bodied world (Neville-Jan, 2004). My experiences are echoed by disabled academics illustrated in the three-university case-studies analysed in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten. Therefore, this chapter is not just a story of me, it is a story of exclusive social, political and cultural concepts, which also apply to many other disabled academics (Chang, 2008).

8.0 Chapter Eight: Analysis of University Case-study one

8.1 Introduction

The first University case-study (1UCS) is one of the leading 'Red Brick' universities in the world (RAE, 2008). It is also recognized for maintaining some of the best teaching, learning and research practises among British universities (REF, 2014). It has approximately 9,000 students and 3,000 employees from all over the world (HESA, 2016).

8.2 Policies and Practises

The 1UCS has students and employees from over 140 countries, therefore it claims the integrity of diversity. It boasts a dynamic mix of people and ideas that creates an excellent international reputation, producing a unique and enriching experience for its employees. For this purpose, a governance structure has been installed by HR comprising of the EDI committee, which seeks to maintain E&D by services accessibility, equitable treatment and multicultural understanding regarding all employees belonging to various protected characteristics. Also, the university has a regulation, ensuring protection from discrimination towards its employees implemented by the Solo Equality Structure (SES).

University documentation states that the SES is refurbished every three years to review current strengths and weaknesses on E&D issues and generate appropriate policy proposals to maximise E&D within the University. The equality data is publicly available through the University website which, at the time of the research, stated that there were approximately 148 disabled employees and 589 disabled students.

Although policy development influenced by the legislation is considered to be fair, equal and just (Boon et al., 2011), it is argued that the legislation (EqA) creates a confusing gap between the policy and its effective implementation (Rainbird et al., 2011, Malika, 2011). To overcome this issue, instead of simply complying with the law, 1UCS incorporates a detailed description of policy, including its requirements, implementation procedures and communication methods. However the data discussed below highlighted that this may create unnecessary bureaucratic barriers and complicated administrative procedures for employees (Adler, 1999). Consequently, instead of simplifying the policy, it is further complicated (Maynard and Maynard, 2000). For example, the SES policy begins with an opening introductory explanation of E&D, then is divided into three sub-sections policies on Anti-Bullying, Anti-Harassment and Victimisation policies, which explains the management process, procedures and the practises involved, as well as examples of either hypothetical or past reported situations, these are again divided into sub-sections. The other section includes describing the organisational culture, which contains descriptions of the HR department

and their connections to the policy, which seems to be an optional necessity to be stated in this section of the policy. Furthermore, it gives the procedure of making a complaint, which is an important part of explaining the policy procedure. However, the procedure does not at all look like a straightforward process. At the end there is a section on 'who to contact' stating a list of people along with their designations and contact numbers, instead of simply having a universal number. It seems that employing such elaborate methods for explaining policies becomes confusing for service users but provides protection to the University from any potential litigation, highlighting how policies can be re-invented to ensure legal self-interest rather than safeguarding the wellbeing of employees.

The 1UCS has a separate policy on disability known as Policy of Disability (PoD), which complies with the EqA and, prior to this, the Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 (SENDA), regarding disability provisions. The PoD focuses on maximising, creating and maintaining accessibility and information regarding services, facilities and activities for disabled and prospective disabled employees. It is claimed that this assists in developing a diverse and inclusive culture, where disability is celebrated and employees feel motivated and confident to disclose their disability, at the same time showing compliance with the Human Rights Act 1998, which includes the right for disabled people's employment (Clements and Read, 2003).

Table 8.1 Equality Policies at 1UCS

Policy	Objective	Duties
SES A set of policies combined together.	Improving E&D across the University. Developing and promoting an inclusive culture, E&D activities for all protected groups, aligned with the EqA legislation and international equality standards.	Responsible for preventing and eradicating discrimination, harassment and victimisation. Promoting E&D and reenergising protected groups of employee's networks by maximising engagement in all possible E&D initiatives, promotions and activities.
PoD Disability specific	Maximising accessibility by taking steps to ensure that no-one is treated less favourably on the ground of disability. Motivation towards disability disclosure.	Responsible for reviewing and monitoring all systems, procedures, facilities, services and buildings in compliance with the EqA. Creating, maintaining and disseminating information about services and facilities available for disabled and prospective disabled employees.

The PoD recognises the social model, which addresses the disabling barriers towards disabled people. However, the policies and procedures also closely follow the EqA on defining disability, suggesting an acknowledgement of the medical model (Geffen, 2013). This contradiction indicates how policies and procedures may become chaotic and confused for disabled employees (Ball, 1993,

Fevre et al., 2013), possibly suggesting a politics of documentation where policies and procedures are used strategically to conceal discrimination and intolerance (Ahmed, 2007b) towards disability, protecting the University from any legal threat.

To monitor the impact of its E&D policies and practices, the 1UCS incorporates an Equality Framework (EF), assisting in the evaluation and recognition of the performance outcomes. The EF is similar to the Equality Impact Assessment recommended by the Equality Challenge Unit, which is not a legal requirement, but is considered to be beneficial in ensuring E&D within policies, practices, procedures, fair decision-making, meeting employees requirements and not discriminating against any protected-characteristic (ECU, 2015b). The policy documentation draws on a business case argument, stating a belief that E&D practises are effective and there is a direct connection towards economic success, demonstrating a correlation between successful businesses and a commitment to diversity, even though the exact chain of causation might be difficult to prove (EC, 2005).

The documentary policy analysis suggested that the policies are described in excessive detail, causing much bureaucracy (Adler, 1999), which might be difficult to be interpreted by disabled employees. Thus, creating a perception that the 1UCS is only interested in protecting itself from legalities, instead of protecting its employees (O'Connell, 2014). Nonetheless, this shall be further analysed through the OH of the disabled academics participants. Lastly, the 1UCS buildings comprise of old Victorian style architecture and physical accessibility was a concern. However, it was discovered that large amounts of finances are being used to create high standards of accessibility.

8.3 OH outlines of Disabled academics at 1UCS

The three disabled academics participants interviewed at 1UCS had different disabilities, taught and researched in diverse subjects of academia, briefly mentioned in the table below.

Table 8.2 OH Academic Descriptions of Disabled Academic Participants at 1UCS

Name of Disabled academic.	Type of Disability.	Academic Subject.	OH-interview time.	OH-interview location.
Joseph	Dyspraxia	Politics	3 hours	Staff Room
Catharine	Stammer	Education	3 hours	Academic's office
Nisha	Vision and Spine	Sociology	3.5 hours	Staff Room

8.4 Joseph:

Joseph's age is between 25 and 35 years. He has dyspraxia, which he acquired during his PhD. He teaches Politics and assists in advising his students about disability.

> I have a short-term memory, muscular pain, joint problems and fatigue. Because my brain isn't controlling the body properly and my coordination isn't very good. I walk funny.

Joseph was provided with assistance after disclosing his disability, because support assists in enhancing coping skills for disabled individuals (Hibbard et al., 2002). "I had terrific colleagues who were brilliant in terms of moral support", he described happily. He feels he was also provided with excellent IT support and an assisted workplace. Although he required further assistance towards his disability, was hesitant in asking for it as he was recently employed. However, the legislation suggests that it is crucial for disabled employees to ask for appropriate reasonable adjustments so they can fully participate in employment (Ashtiany, 2011).

Sometimes he has experienced mild hostility and discrimination due to his disability from other colleagues at 1UCS. For example, he was invited to a training course called 'managing disabled student teaching':

> I was shocked to hear from other academics who did research in gender, race, equality, etc., were saying something culturally and socially offensive about disability.

After this incident, he realized that there is an immense lack of disability awareness, even by experts in other areas of equality.

He describes another example of discrimination as follows:

> I was interviewed for a fellowship position and had already informed them about my disability. The interviewer started firing random questions and I wasn't given a chance to present my research properly. I didn't get the job. This experience made me feel unsure about my future as a disabled academic.

However, *Joseph* suggests that disability requirements need clarification and understanding among non-disabled staff. *Joseph* felt this is best done by sharing experiences about the social barriers experienced by disabled employees themselves, resonating with the emancipation of disability (Oliver and Barnes, 2008). In this way, *Joseph* is fulfilling the role of an organic-intellectual, as he is involved in disseminating his disability knowledge and strongly believes that sharing experiences about disability discrimination assist in disability awareness.

8.5 Catharine:

Catharine's age is between 40 and 50. She has a speech disorder, causing her to stammer. She teaches and researches in the Education Department. Apart from her busy academic work schedule, she volunteers at the Stammering Society counselling people with speech disorders and also holds the responsibility of taking care of her family.

Catharine highlighted the particular problems her disability held for as an academic:

> I never had problems talking to students one-to-one. But when I began to teach I had some doubts about talking in front of large volume of people.

In order to successfully talk in front of an audience she had to first inform them that her speech maybe disrupted at times, due to her disability. *Catharine* felt that doing this would make people realize that social behaviours and attitudes are also a barrier towards disability as suggested in the ideology of the social model (Oliver, 1990b).

Catharine is also a great supporter of self-confidence and believes in having a strong positive image to remove barriers (Wehmeyer, 2004).

> I ask myself, am I imposing myself or are others imposing on me? Giving this advice to myself helps me overcome barriers.

She explains that many people who experience this disability are very shy to speak in public and it is a challenging struggle to overcome this difficulty. Furthermore, she describes that before speaking in public, she prepares herself extremely well, becoming an expert in the subject.

Catherine has a confident personality towards her own disability and counsels people at the Stammering Society, but due to her busy work schedule and family-life, she is unable to be involved in the disability politics at 1UCS. Therefore, suggesting that she uses her organic-intellectualism in a different way to *Joseph*. Her contribution is outside of the politics of academic work, in order to ensure that disability discrimination is weakened.

8.6 Nisha:

Nisha's age is between 50 and 60 years. She had a car accident causing spinal injury damaging her eye sight and walking. To manage her vision, she has to wear sun-glasses and uses a walking stick to prevent herself from falling. At the age of 24 she got interested in governance and public policy and decided to do a PhD in social policy. During her PhD she did some teaching, leading to becoming a lecturer after completing her studies. Currently, as an academic, she is involved in mentoring disabled people at 1UCS.

After becoming disabled she experienced some discrimination from her workplace, during a specific time period. This was when a (temporary) manager used offensive language when she came back to work after her four-month sick leave. She finds attitude towards disability a major problem:

> Attitudes plays a huge role, being positive towards me helps me to operate and work better as an academic.

Nisha also suggested that disabled people can be unconsciously discriminated, due to lack of disability awareness by their work colleagues and employers (Barnes et al., 1998).

> My access-to-work application was not made easy by my work colleagues and boss, this was not deliberate, in fact they themselves lacked the knowledge of applying for access-to-work. This should be of high priority, emphasising its vitality towards us.

She is very passionate and determined about disability equality, which led her to run the University's Disabled Staff Network, raising disability awareness and being a role-model for other disabled staff/employees. "Yes, I am the head of the disabled staff network. I want to see all equality, most certainly disability equality. Everyone should see this as a positive image". *Nisha* is most definitely an organic-intellectual, as she uses her disability experiences to enlighten people at 1UCS, which includes students and staff.

8.7 Interpretation and Presentation of Interview Dialogues

In addition to the OHs of the three disabled academics, semi-structured interviews were conducted with three HR managers: *Grey*, *Richard* and *Felicity*. The 1UCS policies are evaluated against the interview responses of both sets of participants. It is identified through the documentary policy analysis above that 1UCS gives importance to having a diverse workforce. The documents claim that value and respect maintaining the rights and dignity of its employees, where disability equality is ensured through inclusion, protection against disability discrimination and providing reasonable adjustments for their disabled employees.

8.8 Theme 1 - Being an academic with disabilities

This section explores the impact of disability on academic work and consistency of policies toward disabled academics at 1UCS. For this purpose, the HR managers' interview comments are examined below.

> *Richard*: Employee well-being and disability are given importance. Historically, we have done ok, but now much better with the financial provision, we have a strong support for staff.

> *Felicity*: Understanding the issues of disabled staff, raising awareness and supporting them in every stage of their employment. We ensure that they are valued and working in an environment that supports their disability.

In summary, the above interview comments give the appearance of 1UCS being disabled-friendly and accessible. *Richard* spoke about having better financial provision, which meant that significant amounts of money were being invested in making buildings accessible and supporting students and staff with disabilities. However, the disabled academic participants' OH indicated that their experience did not in some situations exactly match the hegemony at 1UCS.

Joseph's disability decreases his confidence as an academic, leaving him always worried and exhausted. He describes:

> Although, academia is competitive, I feel because of my disability I have not achieved enough. It makes me tired very easily. It is difficult and damaging dealing with sudden spontaneous unplanned events. For example, being assigned teaching without any notice beforehand is not suitable for me.

In the beginning of his academic career he was anxious about juggling several academic responsibilities, like teaching preparations, research presentations, writing and reading. He finds managing his disability on his own very strenuous and time-consuming allocating him little time and energy towards other academic tasks, like publications. As a fresh academic employee, he was hesitant to ask for assistance from the University, but after asking for some basic reasonable adjustments, for example extra time, he feels slightly more positive about his academic development.

Similarly, *Catharine* was unconfident and insecure in the beginning of her academic teaching career, due to her disability. Such worries would further increase her fatigue and reduce her capacity to work:

> When I began to teach I had doubts about confidence, talking in front of 50-60 people. It is not easy to speak if I am tired or have a lot of things to do.

She continued explaining that her disability was constantly limiting her to progress as an academic, but the major encouragement of colleagues and self-managing her disability, she became a flourishing academic. This suggests that at a workplace it is crucial to have encouraging colleagues (Ely and Thomas, 2001) who are aware about disability. Although *Catharine* understands that the University policies are obligated to provide support towards disabled academics, at the moment she

does not feel a crucial need asking for help towards her disability and prefers to self-manage her disability. Although she is content with this situation, she does explain her routine on spending time and effort on the teaching preparation:

> My stammering is a problem for me. When I give a talk in front an audience, I have to be explicit in my speech and inform people it may take some time to express myself. The best times when I speak is when I prepare extremely well, I know for 10 or 20 minutes I am the expert. I have to do more preparation than a normal person, but this is part of the deal and I don't want to change this.

Nisha explained playfully the teaching strategy she adopted in the beginning of her disability:

> When I was diagnosed I was anxious to teach students, so I attended the classroom with my sun-glasses and my walking stick to help inform all students about my disability. This helped and now I am not embarrassed, I am a full-time disabled academic.

She continued speaking about the adverse amount of stress she experiences when she repeatedly needs to ask 1UCS for the same adjustments. She also explained that dealing with such situations is also exhausting for other disabled academics. For example, ensuring accessibility during meetings that take place on a regular basis:

> For four year I have been going to the same meeting. They know I am visually impaired, but every time when I attend the meeting they always either provide the wrong text or wrong colour font.

This disability mismanagement by the University costs *Nisha* her valuable time and strength, providing insufficiency in assigning time and energy towards essential academic tasks, like marking, suggesting that, 'the politics of disability in the workplace are primarily shaped by employer willingness to accommodate disabled people, rather than by their right to be there' (Foster, 2007: 82).

In comparison, *Joseph* did not experience mismanagement in implementing accessibilities. Perhaps, because *Joseph*, was a junior employee, the University found it convenient to simply provide just basic reasonable adjustments without properly consulting him, hence demonstrating surface level equality practices. As *Joseph* was a junior academic employee, he preferred to risk his disability than his freshly achieved academic employment. This demonstrates traditional intellectualism in the form of common-sense, comprising of irresponsibility and an unconscious-bias or perhaps simply a lack of interest and having no value towards disability accessibility. This indicates that inequality is practiced

more where bargaining around equality policies is practised (Foster, 2007), resulting in unequal treatment for the minority workforce (Hoque and Bacon, 2014: 279).

8.9 Theme 2 - Employment Promotion/Progression

In this section the HR managers' interview comments are used to identify attitudes towards the employment progression of disabled academics:

> *Grey*: Employment progression for disabled academics, we help in unlocking and harnessing talent and skills.
>
> *Richard*: It is a bad practice to discriminate against disabled staff. Our staff recruitment is as 'wide as possible, so we get more talent. This would help develop E&D and help in building encouragement for disabled employees.
>
> *Felicity*: We are now seeking the Two Ticks, which we are putting on our paperwork and encouraging disabled people to apply for work. We accommodate people's needs and requirement.

The interview comments suggest that the University recognizes the importance of having disabled academic employees in creating awareness of different skills and talents. This is justified not only to progress employment, but also because it benefits the organization, hence creating a strong business case (Geber, 1992, Ross and Schneider, 1992). For this purpose, strategies like the use of the Two Ticks symbol (now known as the Disability Confident symbol) was implemented to encourage disabled people to apply for work (Gov.UK, 2016). This symbol means commitment towards the employment, retention, training and development of disabled employees (Gov.UK, 2016). However, according to *Felicity*, this has been acquired recently by 1UCS and will soon be used within the University's management system. 1UCS is therefore still in the process of working towards breaking disability barriers and employing disabled people, which is confirmed below by the experiences of disabled academic participants.

Joseph had decided to have an academic career after completing his PhD. His disability was first diagnosed during his PhD at 1UCS. For this purpose, he was extremely grateful for the provision of assistance by the University, which encouraged him to develop his academic career at 1UCS. However, he did have concerns about becoming an academic and *Joseph* was anxious to find out about the implementation of the Two Ticks symbol/Disability Confident symbol:

> I am applying for a better academic job at 1UCS. Next week I am gonna call HR and ask if they have started applying the Two Ticks yet?

Joseph highlights the problem of publishing for some disabled academics:

> Career in academia is so aggressive. 1UCS is very supportive, but they cannot help with journal publications. For example, publishing with journals is time consuming for me, because I have problems with spelling and grammar, so this is a barrier. No journal accounts for my disability. I think because of this I will not progress!

Publishing in journals is an important criteria in the development of an academic career (Multon et al., 1991). Yet, publishing for disabled academics is an issue that is not specifically supported by 1UCS. Therefore, Barnes (1996) argues that in order to ensure academic career progress, it is necessary to provide assistance towards research and publications.

Catherine identified how her disability adversely impacted her academic work, preventing her from performing well. This is because, stuttering interferes the conversation leading to incorrect communications (Silverman and Paynter, 1990). She thinks about her disability as follows:

> I started working at 1UCS as a student advisor for the MSc providing guidance. Gradually, my colleagues said to me to give lectures, so I agreed and began work. I was scared at first but I became okay, my part-time job became full-time. I have now worked here for 3 years as a Teaching Fellow. I thought my stammering would not be a problem and it hasn't seemed to be a problem.

She manages her disability by allocating her time and energy to various academic tasks, understanding the amount of academic work she can do in a specific time-period. However, encouragement of her colleagues does motivate her to take up more work, which helps in furthering her academic employment.

After becoming disabled, *Nisha* expected a lot of assistance regarding her academic employment, as she was already a well-established academic at 1UCS. However, her disability turned out to be an extreme barrier towards her academic employment progression. She explains this as follows:

> Since becoming disabled I have had many barriers at 1UCS particularly because I am disabled. I have been told by other academics that other universities are better helping disabled people develop their academic career.

Nisha's academic employment progression has decreased, making her feel extremely marginalized. Having a disability makes her feel underprivileged, just like an 'outsider', illustrating that the able-body is privileged and preferred, while the disabled body is believed to be too different and problematic to be included (Foster and Wass, 2013).

In summary, despite the positive disability hegemony espoused by the HR managers at 1UCS, two of the three disabled academic participants felt unsupported, causing anxiety and lack of confidence at the workplace (Adams, 2010). For example, *Joseph* felt unsupported in other academic work and *Nisha* suffered discrimination. This suggests that an urgent implementation of organic-intellectualism based on good-sense is required in order to bring the experiences of disabled academics closer to the hegemony.

8.10 Theme 3 - Disability disclosure

Disability disclosure is encouraged by the University policies and is also supported in the interview comments of the HR managers:

> *Grey*: The more you declare the more the employer can attain specific issues on disability. What more can be done in terms of accessibilities, adjustments, practices, etc. We try our best to provide a climate where people, irrespective of background, feel comfortable to disclose.
>
> *Richard*: Disclosure is lower than it should be, which is a major concern. We do not like this. Maybe staff feels that declaring disability causes disadvantage, which we are trying to overcome, although we encourage people to disclose. We have also signed up with the Two Ticks symbols. We are making things disability-friendly, for example most buildings are fully accessible.
>
> *Felicity*: We promote disability disclosure. We have focused on providing access requirements to disabled staff. Recently, we seek the Two Ticks and will implement this system.

The interview comments demonstrate the benefits of disability disclosure. However, it is still considered as a negative perspective for employees to declare their disability (von Schrader et al., 2014). A self-critical reflection is detected in the interview comments by *Richard*, suggesting that the disclosure rate has been very low. Perhaps, because 1UCS is an influential University and as *Joseph* highlighted, it has a very competitive culture, declaring a disability might be considered risky for disabled employees. Additionally, it is also feared that disability declaration causes stigmatization in the workplace, which may lead to unemployment (Link, 1982). This is hinted at in *Joseph's* OH dialogue below and suggests that this might be intensified if *Joseph's* job is based on a temporary contract. Therefore, disability disclosure should be endorsed by the workplace in such a way that it amplifies a positive perspective towards disability (von Schrader et al., 2014).

Joseph understands the importance of disability disclosure, assisting in providing reasonable accommodation and maintaining focus on obtaining work benefits (von Schrader et al., 2014) for disabled academics. He states:

> I have disclosed my disability. Although, it made me feel insecure, it helped with basic reasonable adjustments.

According to the HR managers' interview comments, the University fully encourages disability disclosure, but *Joseph's* comment depicts scepticism. This shows that 1UCS still needs to work further in the application of good-sense to earn the trust of its disabled employees.

Although, *Catharine* has disclosed her disability, due to the invisibility of her disability, she does not feel the need to remind or inform people about it, perhaps because disability disclosure leads to many substantial negative outcomes, like negative biases (Bishop, 2002). Throughout, her narrative demonstrates that she has been very confident in managing her disability:

> I never needed University to help towards my disability. I coped myself and now I am a successful academic.

It was only later, working as a disabled academic that *Nisha* suffered the barrier of disability discrimination, which has been mentioned earlier and is developed further in Theme 5. In the beginning she experienced a positive response by the 1UCS for declaring her disability. She explains as follows:

> When I became disabled I contacted HR. HR appreciated the fact that I was honest about my disability. They did a full assessment on me, which entailed what office I should work in and the type of lighting that I should be working under, especially with my eye condition. I received an IPAD which was more suited to my eyes as I could simply adjust the font I wanted.

She also explains the necessity of disclosing her disability so that 1UCS understands the provision of appropriate reasonable adjustments, avoiding unnecessary time consumption and frustration (Fitzgerald, 2000). For her, disclosure has been a means of self-preservation, allowing her to request reasonable adjustments. This is crucial for the maintenance of her health, as mismanaged workload worsens disability (Harlan and Robert, 1998, Fevre et al., 2016).

All the participants suggested the importance of disability disclosure as necessary for dignity and respect (Hatfield, 2005). This also helps in providing inclusive practices and appropriate reasonable adjustments, promoting integration and participation of disabled employees (Lucas, 2008), at 1UCS.

Although, *Joseph* did declare his disability, his experience suggests a slight lack of trust regarding disclosure. This is because, he is a new junior employee and his employment position is already precarious, amplifying fears of job insecurity with the University. Therefore precarious work creates additional concern and hesitancy among the junior disabled employees' decisions on disability disclosure, particularly when the disability is invisible and non-declaration is a possibility (Brunner, 2007, Deem et al., 2001). This suggests that the complexities of disability disclosure needs to be understood by the University, because it has both favourable and unfavourable consequences.

8.11 Theme 4 - Provision of help/support and reasonable adjustments

After disabled employees have declared their disability, it is necessary for 1UCS to provide appropriate support and reasonable adjustments. This process is explained by the HR managers' interview comments:

> *Richard*: We ensure to meet and recheck staff-needs, we aim to tackle any problems, i.e. the location of work, the hours and also the equipment required.

> *Felicity*: So, the line-managers of various departments are responsible for providing reasonable adjustment for staff when it's brought to attention. For example, we have a health and safety team who provide work station assessments.

According to *Richard* and *Felicity*, 1UCS ensures appropriate provision of needs and requirements towards disabled academics. Their view is that the University is open towards listening, making changes to advice and recommendations about reasonable adjustments, suggested by disabled employees. Also, it is explained that the manager of each department is responsible for providing suitable reasonable adjustments. This hegemonic position is compared to the experiences of disabled academic participants below.

Joseph emphasised the importance of having reasonable adjustments for employees with disabilities. He also describes the reasonable adjustments he was provided by 1UCS:

> Reasonable support is necessary for disabled academics at a University as it is less stressful and we can fully concentrate on being an academic instead of worrying about our disability. Like for me the University provided a specialist workplace and IT equipment only.

His statement did suggest a kind of hesitancy when discussing his reasonable adjustments provision at 1UCS, which is also captured in Theme 5 and 6. He continues explaining:

> But too much bureaucracies, like medical and GP letters, keeping taxi receipts, train tickets for everyday commute to work. It defeats the real purpose of the reasonable adjustments being provided by 1UCS.

To ensure the success of a disabled employee it is essential that the workplace provides appropriate reasonable adjustments. However, the excessive amount of bureaucracy involved when applying for support regarding requirement for reasonable adjustments is experienced as a difficult situation, making it the responsibility of the disabled employee (Foster, 2007, Befort, 2015). This situation was also experienced by some of the disabled academic participants at 3UCS.

Although, *Catharine* never needed to ask for reasonable adjustments, she suggested that disabled employees know exactly what sort of reasonable adjustments are required as they best know their disability. Hence, they should be provided the opportunity to describe their disability needs and requirement (Brisenden, 1986b, Williams-Whitt and Taras, 2010, Oliver et al., 2012). *Catharine* explained this by saying:

> Listen to the disabled persons, respect them and encourage them instead of making assumptions beforehand. Doing this creates improvements towards reasonable adjustments.

Research shows that employers should not focus on the employee's disability (Morrell, 1990), instead, they should provide the type of support they need to work effectively (Oliver, 1990a). However, in the case of *Nisha's* requests for reasonable adjustments has provoked negative behaviours and attitudes from her (temporary) manager, causing a lot of disruption and hassle, making her feel tired, vulnerable and having no control about the situation, leaving her disappointed (Foster, 2007). She explains this story in her own words:

> The reasonable adjustments that I stated was that I would like to come to work early so that I can go back home early to my son, as well avoiding rush hour. So now a taxi takes me to work and back in the evening. The University had to make the arrangements but doesn't have to pay for it. Access to Work pays for it. My (temporary) manager did not like it. Another reasonable adjustment that I am granted is working from home one day a week. I tend to get more work done from home than I do in the office as I have less distraction surrounding me. However my manager is not pleased about it. Furthermore, my workstation was being assessed by 'Health and Safety' check creating a lot of disturbance and arguments with my (temporary) manager making him/her upset and giving me the attitude. I got the reasonable adjustments, but s/he is not happy. Said I always caused problems when

> applying for further support. Having a positive attitude towards disability should also be a reasonable adjustment as they enable us to work better.

This demonstrates a lack of attention towards the management of disabled employees and inability to understand disabled employee's access requirements within the University, perhaps, because implementing reasonable adjustments initiated the idea that disabled staff are treated more favourably (Foster, 2007, Foster and Fosh, 2010, Foster and Scott, 2015). However, this misses the point that reasonable adjustments are meant to put disabled workers on an even footing with non-disabled people in the workplace (Anjoyeb, 2016). Demonstrating a liberal approach towards equality (Jewson and Mason, 1986), it seems that *Nisha* was assumed to work as any other non-disabled employee after being provided simple and straightforward reasonable adjustments, without any arguments and commotion, similar to *Joseph*.

According to the disabled academic participants it is suggested that employment for disabled people can be preserved through appropriate reasonable adjustment, like flexible working hours and assistive devices (Foster and Wass, 2013). This fully resonates with the policies and the interview comments of the HR managers. However, it seems that *Nisha* experienced aggravation from her (temporary) manager, creating chaos and non-production of work (MacArthur et al., 2015). This demonstrates that having a policy towards help/support and reasonable adjustments for disabled employees is not enough (Harlan and Robert, 1998, Foster, 2007). The behaviours and attitude of employers and/or managers are also an important aspect for the employment of disabled people at 1UCS, which shall be further investigated and discussed below.

8.12 Theme 5 - Attitudes of Employers/Managers

This section concentrates on the interview comments of the HR managers compared with the disabled academic participants' experiences, describing appropriate or inappropriate managerial and/or employer's responses.

> *Grey*: If there's an incident raised by the disabled employee, like, managers having problems with staff, HR should intervene. Then we start to look at what interventions are needed and address this issue.

This interview comment was in response to supporting issues about the behaviours and attitudes practised by the HR and department managers.

1UCS claims to ensure disabled employees' accommodation is an inclusive workplace. Despite this, some of the disabled academic participants found some managers to have a discriminative attitude, whereas others experienced no such issues.

For example, although, *Joseph* was never directly undermined by the University, he always felt uncomfortable asking for help (Addis and Mahalik, 2003), perhaps, because employees belonging to minority groups are often hesitant and reluctant to ask for assistance from their workplace (Foster, 2007). He explains:

> I always felt insecure and vulnerable asking for too much. Like, when there was a transport strike I wanted to tell my boss this is going to be an issue as I suffer chronic fatigue and maybe they'll say how can I be so disabled when I can teach 20 students? I don't want to be seen as a complainer.

He also describes one of his past experiences as follows:

> Before my academic job I had another job. I made many mistakes in my grammar and spelling. So, out of frustration, my manager, belittling me by making fun, I felt like a five year-old kid, so I resigned immediately. After this I didn't have the courage to work for a long time.

Joseph's experiences demonstrate the harmful effects of negative attitudes and behaviour of the manager/employer, causing damaging feelings of oppression and discrimination (Paez and Arendt, 2014).

Similarly, although *Catharine* had not experienced discrimination due to her disability at 1UCS, before her academic career began, she was invited to a job interview, where she was harshly discriminated, making her feel devastated. Apart from this incident, she feels she has not suffered employment prejudice towards her disability:

> I had an interview at a management consultant firm. Because of stuttering, I was told that I will never find a job. I was in tears and so shocked. Apart from this I have never felt like this. Now I am always encouraged to teach even though I stammer. And now I am a successful university, teacher.

Nisha developed a strained relationship with her (temporary) manager, resulting in discriminatory attitudes and behaviours towards her (Appelbaum et al., 2007, Pager and Karafin, 2009). This demotivating and devaluing experience she explains:

> After my accident, coming back to work, I expected a warm welcome from my (temporary) manager. But the response was completely opposite. My (temporary) manager said 'I cannot have a blind person working in here'. My response was I am not blind and if I was this shouldn't be a problem! Since then s/he has a poor attitude towards me. Really shocking to

> be treated like this. I felt they saw the condition, not the person. I could not believe this. I thank god for the Equality-Act which is a safety net to protect me from discrimination.

The poor attitudes of her (temporary) manager was unexpected and horrifying. However, she also experienced good and encouraging attitudes:

> I have had the opposite experiences with our new manager. I told him/her that this is my disability and my manager was polite and supportive and said they will help me as much as they can. HR appreciated the fact that I was honest about my disability. They were supportive and helpful in assistance.

Nisha's new manager, replacing the (temporary) manager , did not create any trouble in accepting her as a disabled academic, instead further encouraged her, making her feel supported and confident.

Nisha was the only disabled academic participant confronting unreasonable challenging behaviours of management, like resistance to reasonable adjustments, when returning to work after acquiring a disability. This suggests that inclusive work practices are achieved through positive attitudes and behaviours of employers and managers (Roulstone, 2003), whereas negativity enhances barriers and employment damage (Becher and Trowler, 2001) towards disabled employees (Foster, 2007).

8.13 Theme 6 – Disability Policies and Practices

This section focuses on the development and maintenance of policies and practices at 1UCS. Following are the interview comments of the HR managers, stated below:

> *Grey*: All our policies are equal, including all protected-characteristics. Disabled employees give suggestions on policies, if they want to. We listen to their complaints and suggestions making changes accordingly.

> *Richard*: We encourage diversity and inclusion in our staff. We are very optimistic about disability equality related policies.

As identified in Theme 2, *Felicity* identified the introduction of Two Ticks as an essential part of the employment policy at 1UCS. According to the above interview statements, the University is confident about the disability polices related to equality. To validate this, a comparison is made of experiences narrated by the disabled academic participants to ascertain if their involvement with disability equality issues is perceived as effective or problematic (Imrie, 1997).

Joseph describes that, although the policies are in place, they are not explicit enough, causing a failure to understand the extent of disability requirements (Oliver, 1996b). He explains:

> I think the policy is there but visibility needs to be further developed. Also, they don't make the effort to inform you properly about it. For example, I wasn't told that I can use Access-to-Work. My travelling would be so much easier.

As noted in Chapter Two, the 'Access-to-Work' grant is paid by the government towards practical support of disabled employees, covering the cost of special equipment, equipment adaptations, payment of fares when commuting to work or a job-interview, a support-worker, service or job coach to help at the workplace, for example. This grant does not affect other benefits (DWP, 2017). *Joseph* suggests that it is the responsibility of employers to make disabled employees aware of Access-to-Work, as it is a crucial element of E&D for every workplace. He also explains his hesitancy in making any complaints to 1UCS is because he is a newly employed academic and did not want to cause annoyance to the University, an issue that is explored further in Theme 8.

Although *Catharine* never had the time and energy to assist with policy creation at 1UCS due to her academic work schedule and family responsibilities, she did emphasise the need for some policy improvements and the importance of involving disabled academics in the creation of policies:

> There is a need for policy improvements, especially on reasonable adjustments and people's behaviour towards disability. This can only be accomplished by taking advice from disabled people at 1UCS.

Nisha also stressed the importance of listening to disabled academic employees at the time of the policy creation, because their experiences are an important pointer to where improvements are necessary (Morris, 2008) ensuring disability accessibility:

> After being an advisor for disabled students about discrimination for a while, the University asked me to help in the procedure-making, I said yes and they believe I can help people to disclose their disability and what is right and wrong for us. Because I have the experience and knowledge.

Although, on the surface the policies are in place, they are elaborately defined creating immense fatigue for the disabled employees to interpret. As contended earlier, overly legalistic policy might demonstrate self-protection of the University, as fulfilling a legal requirement (Hoque and Noon, 2004), rather than being 'user-friendly'. This exploitation of policies to protect the workplace, rather than the vulnerable disabled employees, suggests limited provision for disabled people, poor

facilities management and lack of consideration of disabled people's access requirements within employment policies (Oldham and Hackman, 1981). Therefore, although 1UCS is striving not to give rise to ableism, the disability hegemony is currently being understood as normative assumptions and common-sense from a traditional-intellectual's perspective (Campbell, 2009), while disabled academics are still in the process of attempting to generate organic good-sense.

7.14 Theme 7 - Training on disability awareness

In this section the importance of disability awareness training is investigated. For this purpose, the interview comments of the HR managers indicate that training is necessary to help managers and other employees to better recognize and be aware about disability and accessibilities at the workplace. For example, unconscious-bias training is used to assist in effectively managing disabled employees (Malos, 2015).

> *Grey*: There is mandatory training around unconscious-bias for managers and other employees so they are aware of the reasonable adjustment or/and the potential of becoming disabled. So, it's a continuous reminder about not making unnecessary assumptions, stereotyping and discriminating disabled people.

Being normal or abnormal is created by society (Oliver, 1990b). However, these attitudes can be changed by introducing training which is provided by disabled people themselves (Oliver, 1996b, Peterson and Quarstein, 2001). This is because the tension of the dominant discriminative power created at the workplace through institutional practices includes a range of feelings towards the minority group employees and can only be challenged through the social actions of the minority group towards people's unconscious bias and discrimination (Noon, 2018).

Joseph expressed this:

> Awareness is important so people know about disability and how it affects other people. For example, work arrangements for us needs to be sorted out.

Disability awareness training is presently made available to the entire University. However, *Joseph* feels that disability awareness training is not put into practice:

> I have had some teaching jobs, but they haven't asked me to fill out a disclosure form. So, they do not know if you are disabled.

He suggested that in order to eradicate disability discrimination, disability experiences should be informed during disability awareness training, especially for disabled junior academics and PhD

researchers who might take up temporary informal jobs to earn extra money. Such circumstances can only come into existence once people are trained about disability awareness, discouraging the formation of negative attitudes and oppression (French, 1992). According to *Joseph*:

> Some staff members don't even realize what they are saying about disability, with no consideration if it's culturally and socially offensive. But after telling them they became curious about disability. There should be awareness training and networks where we can meet and discuss their and our experiences.

The hope is that, once people are made aware about disability, they respect it. Therefore, disability awareness training is essential to support focus groups, which are necessary to protect disabled people against discrimination (Stewart and Shamdasani, 2014).

Catherine also explained the significance of disability awareness training and the impact it has on other employees including herself:

> Now we have a disability and well-being office for everybody. Now even I am aware and careful of other disabilities.

During *Nisha's* OH interview, she spoke enthusiastically about creating disability awareness at 1UCS. She first spoke about the importance of disability awareness training and the results when it is abandoned or ignored in society, creating social, environmental and attitudinal barriers (Finkelstein, 1991). *Nisha* said:

> A lot of open talk should be done about disability. People should be more aware of disability so that you are treated equally and support is given to prevent bullying and unfair treatment. This University is changing to better disability equality.

Although, disability in society has always been connected with discrimination, *Nisha* feels that 1UCS is changing its attitudes towards disability, because of the proper introduction of disability awareness training:

> My colleagues from the University have been 100% supportive, they are extremely helpful. For example, now when I enter a room, for a meeting and the lights are extremely bright. When they see me they automatically, without asking switch off the extra lights to make me feel comfortable.

All of the participants suggested the importance of disability awareness training and its benefits. *Nisha's* narrative illustrates a progressive time-line as, when she became disabled during her career

at 1UCS, she found that she was being discriminated, due to lack of disability awareness. However, she and the other disabled academics at 1UCS felt that positive change was underway. Resonating with the interview statement of *Grey that* also suggested the impact of disability awareness training. These findings suggest that awareness training is a necessity in eradicating stigma and stereotyping towards disability (Salih and Al-Kandari, 2007), which the next section focuses on.

8.15 Theme 8 - Stigmatizing and Stereotyping

This section focuses on the disabled academic participants' experiences of stigmatizing and stereotyping of disability, which is also endorsed by the interview comments of the HR managers demonstrated as follows:

> *Richard*: Our staff recruitment is diverse. If there is talent we do not discriminate. They are role-models developing E&D helping eradicate stigma and stereotyping.
>
> *Grey*: Having more disabled academics creates awareness. Telling us where the barriers are making it accessible at 1UCS. Although we provide support but I think more work needs to be done to get rid of stigma and stereotyping.
>
> *Felicity*: Although, the history has created much stigma and stereotypes towards disability in education and employment at the University this is being eradicated by strategies from the top of the hierarchy for e.g. the vice-chancellor of the University.

It was also a good self-reflection suggested by *Felicity*, that to eradicate stigma and stereotypes, first of all 1UCS needs to fix their own perception towards disability. Furthermore, the focus of the above interview comments is largely on the employment of diverse academics and 1UCS having inclusive practises. Therefore, having a variety of academic employees means using fair and equal treatment for the University to be a good place for disabled academics. In order to verify this, disabled academic participants' OH are used to identify the impact of stigma and stereotyping that already exists at the University.

Joseph explains that there is no obvious discrimination seen at 1UCS, but having a disability creates stereotypes and stigma, which gives rise to undesirable traits (Stone et al., 1992). Although, he was provided with basic adjustments/assistance, he did not want to ask for further assistance as he was not confident about his job security at 1UCS, demonstrating a fear of losing his employment due, to his disability (Lindsay, 2011).

Through his OH it has been distinguished that initially, *Joseph* was sceptical about being an academic and was also well aware of the stereotyping and stigma towards disabled employees. However, soon

this stereotyping and stigmatizing of his disability became an inspiration for him by challenging his ability to remain in academic profession at 1UCS.

For *Catherine*, stereotyping and stigma towards disability at 1UCS became a source of encouragement, never allowing herself to be worried about the limitations caused by her disability. She describes this in a bold manner as follows:

> I have seen people leave the room after a few minutes, maybe because of my speech. If my disability is a problem for them then too bad.

Furthermore, she decided to teach as an academic, challenging herself to eradicate stereotyping and stigmatizing towards disability. She believed doing this would give her confidence and help create disability awareness among non-disabled people (Daly et al., 1995).

Initially, *Nisha* felt undervalued at 1UCS due to experiences of disability stereotyping and stigma (Stone et al., 1992, Major and O'Brien, 2005). However, similar to *Catherine*, *Nisha* never permitted herself to be demoralised by disability stereotyping and stigma. In fact, this became a source of inspiration, describing as follows:

> My disability is part of me; it has enabled me to be more understanding, more accommodating and more aware of the people around me. As a result, it has made me stronger and determined. I am a role model for disabled staff in tacking disability abuse.

Nisha drew her strength from her understanding that stigma and stereotyping of disability is a social-construction (Whittington-Walsh, 2002) and is best altered through using mentors and supporters (Kelan, 2008).

All of the participants gave similar suggestions, feeling emancipated and liberated by challenging disability stigmatizing and stereotyping (Groom et al., 2003) at 1UCS. Suggesting that, although the University was still dominated by traditional common-sense, a counter-hegemony is taking place, with disabled academics aiming to win the war-of-position by using organic-intellectualism. Hence, the University is in transition, developing an organic hegemonic ideology, which may soon become the dominant hegemonic ideology at the University (Mayo, 2014).

8.16 Conclusion

In this Chapter, an in-depth analysis of 1UCS has been described in detail. In the beginning, the policies on equality are examined and analysed, which seem to be particularly well-informed and fair. However, they are highly detailed and elaborated in nature causing complexities for the disabled employee. This is followed by short work-history outlines of the three disabled academic

participants, describing their employment background and the kind of intellectualism they belong to at 1UCS. A large portion of this case-study analysis contains the narrative inquiry, comprising of three semi-structured interview comments with the HR managers and three OH dialogues with the disabled academics. These have been used to investigate the socio-political behaviours of the able-bodied environment within 1UCS, by capturing experiences, exploring different realities through the interviews and cross-analysing and comparing the policies at 1UCS. Thus, exploring the similarities, differences, easiness and difficulties experienced by the disabled academics, at 1UCS.

This investigation has produced significant issues which are harmonious, but also conflicting. For example, in Theme 5 when discussing attitudes of employer/manager, in the case of *Nisha* when having conflicting arguments with her (temporary) manager, then a congruent discussion with her new manager regarding her disability requirements. These findings demonstrate that 1UCS was largely influenced by the common-sense of traditional-intellectuals creating predominance-of-consent. However, currently a counter-hegemony is taking place and a war of position is aiming to be won by the organic-intellectuals, which is elaborated in Chapter Four. Hence, the organic-intellectuals are busy in the development of good-sense which may soon become the hegemonic ideology at the University (Mayo, 2014). Also, in Theme 3 it is suggested that 1UCS needs to further develop its understanding towards disability disclosure, in order to establish more good-sense to achieve dignity and respect for the disabled employees (Hatfield, 2005). This suggests that in some cases organic-intellectualism is struggling to convince and maintain an organic ideology within the hegemonic system at 1UCS.

In conclusion, it can be said that this chapter has managed to expose the detailed social-reality of disabled academic employees. It proposes that organic-intellectualism at 1UCS is in the process of producing a new critical counter-hegemonic ideology of disability by attempting to reject the previous established traditional hegemonic ideology and ultimately trying to convert common-sense into good-sense (Gramsci, 1971a).

9.0 Chapter Nine: Analysis of University Case study two

9.1 Introduction

The second University case-study (2UCS) is a post-1992 'new university'. It came into existence through a merger of three Polytechnic Colleges. The 2UCS is now one of the largest post-1992 teaching universities (OECD, 1998) and its study programmes are ranked among the top five universities in the UK (REF, 2014). At the time of the research there were approximately 31,508 students and 4,530 members of staff from different parts of the world (HESA, 2015).

9.2 Policies and Practises

At the 2UCS, E&D is defined as valuing diverse talents and providing a successfully flourishing environment for all protected characteristics, demonstrating a positive direction towards equal opportunities and ensuring the best performance for its employees. It has a strategy plan called 'Schema-2020' (S2020), which claims to provide an excellent, diverse research and employment experience (Flecha, 2014). Therefore, 2UCS promises to continuously support and encourage the inspirational talents and promote good E&D practises, which is a strong marketing tool for the University (Barak, 2013).

E&D at the University is ultimately the responsibility of the leadership and governance body containing the University's Board of Governors. The Board consists of members from a variety of backgrounds and/or protected-characteristics, including disability. It is their duty to ensure that the University policies and S2020 are effectively implemented, coordinated and remain in compliance with the legislation.

E&D is maintained through an Equality Impact and Performance Management Framework (EIPMF), similar to the Equality Impact Assessment recommended by the ECU. It is not a legal requirement, but a beneficial tool in ensuring policies, practices, procedures and decision-making do not discriminate against any protected characteristics (ECU, 2015b). The EIPMF involves assessing and identifying performance outcomes of policies, practises and procedures, towards various protected characteristics at the University to insert equality into the decision-making structures of the University. These outcomes are then discussed for approval with the University's Board of Governors. Once approved, new and/or changing employment policies are developed and communicated, via internal mail, workshops and the HR web-pages.

The 2UCS has three standardised employment policies clearly defined on the University website for employees belonging or not to any protected-characteristics, demonstrating an integrated policy making approach (Davidson and Cooper, 1992, Alshuwaikhat and Abubakar, 2008). The three employment policies are Reasonable Accommodation/Flexible Working Policy (RAFWP), Harassment

Policy and Procedures/Dignity at Work (HPP) and Maternity/Parental/Adoption/Paternity Leave (MPAPLP) explained in the table below.

Table 8.1 Equality Policies at 2UCS

Policy	Objective	Duties
RAFWP	Protecting all the under-represented groups from discrimination, harassment and victimisation by promoting good-relations, providing equal-opportunities and encouraging an inclusive-culture.	Responsible for providing reasonable-adjustments or flexible-working hours, if necessary, at any stage of employment without discriminating against any protected-characteristic.
HPP	Maintaining dignity of all employees regardless of their protected-characteristics. Eliminating discrimination, harassment and victimisation.	Responsible for maintaining this policy among its employees. If broken, strict actions by implementing the equalities-law are taken to restore equality.
MPAPLP	Assisting employees experiencing special-circumstances, like becoming a mother or a parent.	Responsible for giving Maternity/Parental/Adoption/Paternity time-off.

It is suggested that being affiliated with equality advocates or having equality champions, increases employee satisfaction, improves employer's reputation as a responsive organisation that focuses on innovative problem solving, ensuring implementation of E&D (EC, 2008). For this purpose, 2UCS is a member of Athena SWAN, which suggests a commitment to advancing women's careers (ECU, 2015a). In relation to disability, policies adopt the social model with a focus is on eradicating the disabling barriers at the University. The University is endorsed by DisabledGo, which is an award winning disability organisation, whose aim is to enlighten society about disability, provision of opportunities and encouraging employment for disabled people (DisabledGo, 1999). The University has also been awarded the Two Ticks symbol/ Disability Confident symbol.

The E&D policies are underpinned by legislative compliance, suggesting that integration of legislation leads the creation of policies and practises on E&D (Sigafoos, 2016). For this purpose, the S2020 incorporates the statutory requirements of the PSED, reinforcing the equality objectives through the specific duties. Furthermore, E&D at 2UCS is embedded by monitoring, evaluating, analysing, planning, performing and informing the decision-making process regarding the protected characteristics. Equality data is collected regularly and made publicly available on the University website. At the time of the research there were 3,644 disabled students and 166 disabled staff.

According, to the EqA and the Children and Families Act 2014 maternity, parental, adoption and paternity are protected characteristics (Gov.UK, 2014). Drawing on this legislation, equality policies at 2UCS provide leave and offer additional provision beyond statutory rights, which include 'time off for dependents', together with the option of taking unpaid leave at a manager's discretion. 'Keep in Touch' days and meetings are promoted to ensure employees on leave do not lose touch with their University's department at their workplace. This also applies to employees caring for disabled people, which has been established through previous employment tribunals in *Coleman v Attridge Law* where the claimant had been discriminated, because she was the primary carer for her disabled son. The university therefore recognises the changes made to the legislation.

Investigation of the University policy suggests that the legislation is being fully implemented. For example, the Reasonable Accommodation/Flexible Working-Policy (RAFWP), considers all applicants' aptitudes, abilities and qualifications. This is observed, it is claimed, by providing reasonable adjustments at any stage of employment without discriminating against employees belonging to any protected characteristic. How far this is born out in practice will be explored by investigating the experiences of the disabled academic participants.

This analysis suggests a compliance approach at 2UCS, however the University goes a step forward from legal compliance by explicitly defining and explaining each employment policy in minimum words and an easy language. For example, regarding the RAFWP, the University recognises the advantages of a balanced approach towards work and family-life (Costa et al., 2004). At the end of the policy description the following statement is added "Remember, it is your legal right to apply for reasonable adjustments and flexible-working hours", also a good practise adopted from the EHRC (EHRC, 2014). Therefore, 2UCS encourages requests for reasonable adjustments, suggesting a willingness to adopt the social model.

9.3 OH outlines of disabled academics at 2UCS

This section gives an overview about the three disabled academics participants' employment at 2UCS, which is summarised in the table below.

Table 9.2 OH Academic Descriptions of Disabled Academic Participants at 2UCS

Name of Disabled academic.	*Type of Impairment/Disability.*	*Academic Subject.*	*OH-interview time.*	*OH-interview location.*
Sydnie	Mental-health	Researcher (Brain-injury)	2 hours	Personal office

Ann	Spinal Injury	Nursing	3 hours	Staff Room
Peter	Emotional-instability	Researcher (Brain-injury)	3.5 hours	Academic's office

9.4 Sydnie:

Sydnie's age is between 40 and 50 years. She does research on brain injury survivors' life-experiences. She also works part-time in a youth club for young disabled people, where she holds an important position in decision-making. *Sydnie's* disability does not allow her to do much practical work by herself, but once she has been familiarised with the work-environment, she then has the capability to work by herself.

At the age of 21 while returning back home from work, *Sydnie* had an accident which made her disabled.

> I crashed into three cars and a bus which force-sliced my brain. I was in a coma for four months. After this, I had rehab for three years; I am half-paralyzed and have memory problems.

Her disability also caused difficulties during her university education, where she was not allowed to choose a subject of her choice to study, making her feel further disabled. Although this circumstance occurred before the establishment of any proper equality legislation on disability, now she has managed to secure academic employment. *Sydnie* has experienced issues with support workers and carers in her personal life, highlighting, that often even professional disability support workers lack patience and fail to understand disabled people (Jingree et al., 2006).

Sydnie also described with excitement her thrilling experience of being part of the London 2012 Para-Olympic. "I was invited by Nick Clegg to be part of the torch relay!" However, after the event she did not hear from them again, leaving her feeling exploited, sad, and diminishing her importance as a person (Marková, 1991). *Sydnie* is also perceived as an organic-intellectual, because her research and work as a youth leader provides much good-sense in relation to disability.

9.5 Ann:

Ann's age is between 45 and 55 years. She became disabled due to a car accident, leaving her with a broken-spine. "So, I suffer a lot of pain and have difficulty walking". She has been working for 10 years as a lecturer in the department of nursing.

> I have been very lucky teaching nursing as the students have been accommodating and the University is extremely supportive.

She finds working as an academic at 2UCS very flexible, although, before becoming disabled she worked as a nurse at a clinic. In 2008 she started working at 2UCS as a contract-based lecturer, but soon was made a permanent academic. She was disabled when she was recruited by the University and she has been provided with an accessible work-station, appropriate IT equipment and other necessary support according to her needs and requirements.

At her workplace, she has never experienced disability discrimination, stigmatisation or stereotyping. Whereas, outside her academic career she encounters a lot of discrimination:

> I have had episodes whilst shopping and, on the buses, where I cannot move due to severe pain. I have been abandoned, left on my own and my husband had to come to rescue me. I struggle when outside University, people slamming the doors on my face and also people not being mindful of disability.

Ann enjoys working as an academic and appreciates the support provided by 2UCS. She also explained that her University manager and colleagues always encouraged her to move forward in her academic career. She is unable to be involved in the disability politics at 2UCS, because she holds a busy academic role and a busy family life in addition to her disability. However, *Ann* uses her teaching to disseminate organic-intellectualism and instil good-sense in future generations of nursing professionals.

9.6 Peter:

Peter's age is between 45 and 55 years. He suffers from mental health issues. He is a disability advisor and researcher, providing consultation services and doing research on post-traumatic stress caused by brain injury. Being disabled himself he is determined to eliminate disability stereotyping and stigma (Wendell, 1989).

Peter had an accident on his way to his University, causing brain damage, making him disabled. He was provided with much support at the University. "I would get lost ending up in wrong locations and late to my lectures, so they employed someone to help me to lectures".

His IQ-level is 150 and is deemed medically fit by doctors to work, however, his disability allows him to be forgetful (Blennow et al., 2012). For example, he describes playfully one of the incidents:

> I kept forgetting my wife's name and she'd get upset.

He has also experienced being a victim of discrimination by strangers (Barnes, 1985):

> Last Friday at work, I received a phone call. The person on the phone said we trying to fix a problem on your computer, please give us your card details to solve the problem. I got confused and told him that sorry I do not understand, I am disabled. After, hearing this he sounded quite aggressive and rude towards me. Although the person on the phone was a hacker, but I felt disappointed to find out that when the caller discovered I was disabled he treated me badly.

Peter suggests that discrimination exists, because society has a negative outlook towards disability, creating barriers and causing stigma, stereotyping and disability discrimination, which can be eliminated through appropriate education and awareness training (Davidson et al., 2007). He is currently a researcher in brain injury giving rise to homelessness and its complexities. His research has gathered much interest from other professional researchers and academics. Therefore, *Peter* can be described as an organic-intellectual using his experiences, i.e. good-sense, as a disabled academic inside and outside of the University, through his own personal experience and also through his research.

9.7 Interpretation and Presentation of Interview Dialogues

The focus of this section is on the analysis of interviews provided by the HR managers *Andie, Bailey* and *Teresa* and the three disabled academic participants, in conjunction with the documentary policy analysis of 2UCS.

In summary, the equality documents at 2UCS covered inclusion, active involvement and engagement of disabled employees in planning, policy-making, estates (architecture of University buildings), training and development, setting of agendas, contributing to the marketing strategy, delivery and evaluating the processes and outcomes of 2UCS regarding E&D. The documents claim that the University ensures opportunities for disabled employees to communicate smoothly so that their feedback is received effectively. The university has established a formal structure regarding recruitment and selection of disabled people, ensuring continued and increasing encouragement of disability equality. Simultaneously, 2UCS proclaims that it continues to engage with disabled people across the University, providing them with appropriate reasonable adjustment according to their needs and requirements. This shall be further analysed through the OH interviews with disabled academic participants.

9.8 Theme 1 - Being an academic with disabilities

The 2UCS policies appears to be extremely accessible and welcoming towards disabled academics. The HR managers support the positive picture painted by the documentation:

> *Andie*: Within HR we do not have a specific policy on disability. We all have a responsibility to comply with the EqA. This involves staff within HR and the rest of the University.
>
> *Bailey*: One of the keys issues are for disabled staff is career progression. We are good at recruiting disabled staff, examining their career progression. For example, how to assist them when working from home. Every staff member has the right to work at home, if they are not teaching. And allowed to borrow equipment and take home from work as part of reasonable adjustments.
>
> *Teresa*: We support disability just like the rest of the eight protected-characteristics. We do yearly assessments where we observe and take recommendation to improve accessibility in the University environment.

Their interview comments seem to contain good evidence of critical self-reflection, as they ensure to accommodate disabled academics at the University by providing necessary supporting equipment and accessibility. Consequently, both the policies and the approach of the HR managers at 2UCS appear to create an inclusive environment for its disabled academics. How far this is the experience of disabled academics will be further investigated through the disabled academics' OHs.

Sydnie's experience as a student at another higher educational institute (HEI), approximately twenty years back, was less positive. Unfortunately, HEI was unable to understand the intensity of her disability, which led to the inability to provide professional guidance in accommodating her disability. This happened before there was any protective legislation for disabled students. She complains that this made her feel helpless, emotional and detached from higher education (Samuels, 2003). *Sydnie* was extremely grieved by this past experience. However, at present, her employment at 2UCS has a positive impact:

> Because of my disability I was unable to choose my subject to study in. But now I like my work as a researcher.

Ann recognizes her disability as giving rise to experiences of frustration and creating difficulties. She explains the changes her disability has brought about in terms of her working-day schedule. For example, an additional three hours required for personal care everyday (having lunch, toileting, etc.), taking additional time within her working day. For this purpose, she is provided flexible working hours as part of her reasonable adjustments. *Ann* is further well accommodated within the University through provision of various utilities and accessibilities, resonating with the positive policies and endorsing the interview comments of the HR managers.

Ann takes great care to ensure that her disability does not affect her academic employment. For this purpose, she has developed an acceptable working remit of small teaching sessions, which require less standing while teaching, postgraduate/PhD-supervisions and increased home-based activities like marking student work. These can be paced over a manageable time-period and spaced between teaching and other face-to-face academic activities. *Ann's* experience demonstrates that flexibility regarding academic work is an important enabling feature for disabled academics (Baruch and Hall, 2004). *Ann* further explains that she has been very fortunate to be teaching 'Nursing' as she is able to develop a co-operative relationship with the students by giving examples of her own disability experiences:

> I have had to cut my lesson short because of my back, informing my students about this. I have been very lucky since I have been teaching nursing. I found that the more honest I have been with the students they have been accommodating and considerate towards me.

Ann uses her disability as a tool to inform her academic teaching, which assists nurses to understand, especially when experiences of disabled people are required (Oliver, 1998b). She explains:

> The students have been good and patient as I share my personal experiences using this as a life experience, and the students can relate with you so there is a mutual understanding. I create interest for students by giving examples from my body. I have been lucky in my academic teaching.

Peter described his disability as frustrating, however it has encouraged him to accomplish big things in life. He keeps a daily diary to manage his disability, which assists him in writing down everything he did during the day. Allowing him to allocate his time and energy to work tasks in relation to his academic employment. Being influenced by his own disability (Barnes and Mercer, 1997a), he explains as follows:

> I hope my research raises awareness among health, housing and care professionals about how someone's support needs will differ if they have a brain injury.

Peter spoke about a fantastic service the University provided him with in order to overcome his fear of getting lost due to his disability (Baldwin and Johnson, 1998). Demonstrating the positive impact of 2UCS policies and supporting the interview comments of the HR managers.

Peter felt he did not have to waste his time and energy to strategize a plan to manage his disability. The support provided to him is demonstrated as follows:

> This person would help me map where I would find my lecture-room. So, I didn't have to worry, because these strategies saved time and were provided at work.

Sydnie, *Ann* and *Peter* are disabled academics that are involved in different types of academic work, but have had similar positive experiences regarding their disabilities at 2UCS. However, *Sydnie* experienced slightly different issues as a disabled university student, which made her less confident about her potential, suggesting the importance of disability management (Williams and Mavin, 2012). Although, *Sydnie* is happy in her employment, her choice of subject area and subsequent career should not have been defined by her disability.

9.9 Theme 2 – Employment Progression

The policies at 2UCS encourage career progression, providing full support to disabled academics. This is supported by the HR managers' interview comments below:

> *Andie*: We comply with the Two Ticks Positive about Disability. We show our commitment to good practice in employing disabled people. It enables disabled people to know which employers will be positive about their abilities.

> *Bailey*: Yes, Two Ticks, we also support employees belonging to different characteristics.

> *Teresa*: Raising awareness, promoting positive attitudes and encouraging participation by disabled people. On a positive side becoming more visible in many ways, doing well in terms of diversity, which is also a useful marketing tool.

The interview comments suggest that employing disabled academics creates diversity and disability awareness (Robinson, 2013). To accomplish this, the University recognizes that every disabled employee has different needs and requirements to progress in their employment (Geber, 1992). For example, the University adopts strategies like the usage of the Two Ticks symbol/Disability Confident symbol, to encourage disabled academics to apply for work. Lastly, *Teresa* says that employing disabled academics means encouraging and supporting them, which also assists in developing a strong business case (Ross and Schneider, 1992). How far this is a reality experienced by disabled academics is explored further below.

Sydnie's past experience of academia has assisted in reducing her confidence, demonstrating, that disabled academics are too different and problematic to deal with, often considered as 'outsiders' (Deegan, 1992). This seems to be reinforced by the historical ableist hegemony where disabled people stood out. Even now they are being neglected and considered in the position of 'other' in

society (Foster and Wass, 2013). However, *Sydnie* anticipates the need to work for the purpose of self-worth and job satisfaction (Uppal, 2005).

In contrast to *Sydnie*, *Ann* sees an academic career offering flexibility when working with a disability, accommodating working-patterns and arrangements, like working from home, resonating with flexibility as an enabler of academic careers (Baruch and Hall, 2004). She also highlights that her disability did not lock her into an insecure and precarious job. This being an important factor, she explained an example relating to one of her own experiences:

> When I started my academic work, I was already disabled. Then slowly I moved to senior lecturer and then programme leader.

According to her, the University is extremely supportive, fair and just, when it comes to issues of recruitment and employment progression (Hoque and Noon, 2004), specifically regarding disability.

Peter's narrative reflects upon the extent to which being a disabled academic intertwines with employment progression. When he applied for a promotion at 2UCS, he provided details of the ways in which he will work and all the adjustments he expected from his employer. By doing this, he indicated to his employer the need to acknowledge these requirements (Gates, 2000) and accommodation of disability for academic progression (Schur et al., 2005).

> I wrote a paper called 'the perception of severe head injury as a social problem', during the process the University helped with spelling mistakes, proof-reading and got accepted.

Peter was provided support with employment progression, which is necessarily dependant on enhanced accommodation and adjustments, like publications. It seems that most of the disabled academic participants were well provided with assistance and accommodation at 2UCS, which fully resonates with the statements of the HR managers and the policies.

9.10 Theme 3 – Disability Disclosure

The policies at 2UCS seem to accommodate disability disclosure. Furthermore, the interview comments of the HR managers also appear to strongly encourage disclosure of disabled academic employees:

> *Bailey*: And there are staff who are disabled and do not want to disclose this because people are hesitant to disclose, but we still encourage.

> *Teresa*: Some rule themselves out of disclosure thinking they will be treated unfairly, but we want to ensure them not to feel afraid. But rather we welcome staff and help with their

> situation. Disclosure is necessary, so we can work on accessibility and change the attitudes and behaviours towards disability.

In their interview comments some interesting critical self-reflection can be detected, while explaining that some employees refrain from declaring their disability, perhaps because even when a university has progressive disability equality policies, disclosure is considered to be risky. This is because employees with disabilities are still frequently discriminated. However, this can be overcome by installing appropriate support for disclosure and encouraging employment progression of disabled employees, which is further recognized in the OH of the disabled participants below.

Although *Sydnie* declared her disability, she felt suspicious and ambivalent over the intentions of 2UCS encouraging disclosure. Possibly, because of her past experiences resulting in a lack of trust and concern about the response of disability disclosure and its consequential impact upon her career (Brunner, 2007). She says as follows:

> I am not sure about disclosure, but in my case, I have to disclose because my disability is severe.

For *Ann,* disability disclosure is crucial to maintain her health and well-being because of her requirement for reasonable adjustments. For this purpose, she has a particular work schedule in place. She strongly believes that disability disclosure is a means of improving working arrangements for others and also benefiting the workplace (Lucas, 2008). *Ann* suggests as follows:

> I would like staff to disclose that they are disabled so we (2UCS) can work on this and change the attitudes and behaviour that currently exist.

Furthermore, *Ann's* statement suggests that disclosure does not only lead towards application of appropriate reasonable adjustments, but assists in gaining other collective benefits like changing attitudes. She also explains that disability disclosure assists in establishing the suitability of potential employers. It is an opportunity to declare requirements on application for posts, and discussing this at interviews, which filters out potentially damaging work experiences. She also considers that organizations are not worth working for, which do not encourage disability disclosure (Brunner, 2007).

Peter also preferred to declare his disability. He informed the University, and they immediately provided support by re-negotiating his work remit to accommodate him:

> Got accepted. Informed them about my disability. The University was supportive and I was assigned someone to take me from one place to another.

All of the disabled academic participants mentioned the importance of using disability disclosure assisting in promoting disability inclusive practices. This is supported by the HR managers recognizing the positive impact towards managing disability, leading to dignity and respect for the disabled employees (Hatfield, 2005). However, *Sydnie's* past experience demonstrates lingering scepticism, having a negative consequential impact upon careers, suggesting a hesitation towards disability disclosure (Brunner, 2007, Deem et al., 2001). Therefore, 2UCS has recognised the necessity of implementing accommodation regarding intricate relationship between the work environment and employees' disability disclosure (Allaire, 2004, Goldberg et al., 2005), rather than just considering disability disclosure as always positive.

9.11 Theme 4 - Provision of help/support and reasonable adjustments

According to the policy analysis, 2UCS provides appropriate support and reasonable adjustments to its disabled employees. This also resonates with the interview comments of the HR managers:

> *Bailey*: We provide technology and equipment for disabled academic staff, like IT set-up or reasonable adjustments, such as taking equipment from work to their home. We ensure that flexible hours are provided to all disabled staff depending on their requirements.
>
> *Teresa*: We ensure to meet and recheck the staff needs and we aim to tackle any problems, i.e. the location of work, the hours and also the equipment they require. We do yearly risk assessments, where we observe and given recommendations to help improve accessibility environments of the University. For example, the working from home policy, so every staff has the right to work at home if they are not teaching or do not have meetings. Also, disabled staff under reasonable adjustments policy are allowed to take home equipment from work, so they have access to this in their home.
>
> With disabled academic staff, work and seminar hours are all structured and everything is tailored, adjustments are made to manage their workload and also the location where they are working. For example, a wheelchair staff member will be carefully considered, when locating their office, not on top of a hill.

After disability declaration, it is then necessary to provide support and consider reasonable adjustments. This procedure is further investigated from the perspective of disabled academics below:

Sydnie does not feel comfortable traveling to faraway places for work, causing her reduction in confidence due to her disability. For this reason, she is provided with travel assistance, a service provided to disabled employees. This coincides fully with the policies and with the interview

comments of the HR managers stated above. Also, suggesting that a workplace symbolises a 'contractual-agreement between employers and their employees' (Vischer, 2005: 5).

Ann explained that from the very beginning 2UCS had adopted very inclusive approaches towards her employment management, never focussing on her what her disability prevented her from doing (Morrell, 1990). She was provided the type of support she needed to work effectively (Oliver, 1990a), explaining as follows:

> The University has been very supportive provided me with a mobility scooter so I can go from one class to another when I am in pain. They have given me a blue badge for my parking which has been great coming in to work. The buildings here maintained to ensure accessibility, which has helped me significantly. My work station is really accessible and adapted to my needs such as mouse and keyboard.

She also explains that providing appropriate adjustment and support helps in improving her performance at the workplace. She also enjoys benefits like 'healthcare' making her feel motivated and further incentivised to remain a loyal employee (Fay and Thompson, 2001). Although, healthcare is something that would be available to all employees at 2UCS, it might be especially valued by disabled employees, further valuing and privileging the disabled employees at the workplace (Hinkin and Tracey, 2010, Sandhya and Kumar, 2011).

> At the moment I enjoy family perks, like getting my daughter's eye-sight checked.

An important aspect of offering disabled employees' support is the provision of flexible working hours. This is already a mandatory policy at 2UCS called Reasonable Accommodation/Flexible-Working Policy (RAFWP), which *Ann* already follows and is able to use to manage her disability requirements (Thomas, 2007a). She explains:

> Sometimes I have had to cut my lesson short, because of my back, informing my students about this. At times it is a struggle to wake up from my bed, especially after changing my medications, coming to work in the morning. But if I cannot come to work, I work at home and inform my manager about this.

Peter explained that not having appropriate reasonable adjustments at the workplace may leave the disabled employee disillusioned and divided, for this purpose it is now a legal obligation for workplaces to have reasonable adjustments (Foster, 2007). He also has proper support in place, which has already been mentioned above in Theme 1.

Sydnie's, Ann's and *Peter's* experiences demonstrates that proper support, policies and workplace accommodations, like flexible working hours and assistive devices, sustains employment (Roulstone et al., 2004, Foster and Wass, 2013). At 2UCS assistance is voluntarily provided to disabled employees, therefore, implementing the social model, which has now become the hegemonic ideology of the University.

9.12 Theme 5 - Attitudes of Employers/ Managers

The policies at 2UCS put the focus on positive attitudes and behaviours of managers to encourage disabled academics to apply and remain in academic employment. To confirm this the HR manager stated:

> *Teresa*: There is no hierarchy structure, it is about the culture of the workplace respecting each other. We operate using 'good-practices' so the number of barriers faced by disabled people are reduced.

This is explored further from the perspective of disabled academic participants below:

Sydnie's OH suggests that policies at 2UCS positively impact upon her employment experiences and opportunities. She explains as following:

> They have been inclusive even though my disability is intense. I feel privileged.

They have focussed on *Sydnie's* ability of academic researching, rather than her disability, leading to good relationships within the workplace (Appelbaum et al., 2007).

Ann had positive experiences with University managers/employers, identifying positive attitudes, which she explains as follows:

> They have been supportive towards me. Also, I am scheduled to have my surgery/operation soon and I informed my manager who has been terrific towards me about this.

This attitude and willingness of managers/employers to engage with disabled academics, demonstrates encouragement towards sustaining employment (Foster, 2007). *Ann* further explained that positive attitudes and good relationships with employers/managers are crucial in developing strong networks within employment (Erickson, 2001), which is widely recognized in academia (Baruch and Hall, 2004).

Peter also experienced positive attitudes from 2UCS. However, his previous experience with another university was horrific, where it was difficult to hold a meaningful professional conversation:

> I applied to give sociology lectures at a University. They phone-called me to tell me I got the position. At that time, I didn't remember and my wife prompted me saying you did apply for this position. So, I phoned back and told them because I have a memory problem with my brain that's why I couldn't remember applying for this position. But after hearing this they said 'we don't want to employ someone disabled'.

Non-acceptance of disability leaves a negative impact upon disabled employees' well-being (French, 2001) and *Peter* did not expect such negative attitudes and poor behaviours from the employer. On hearing such an appalling response, he felt as if his disability was problematic leaving him demotivated.

In contrast, as soon as *Peter* was registered as a disabled employee at 2UCS, he was provided support and accommodation, although, there was some uncertainty when employing *Peter* at 2UCS due to his disability. This indicates a different hegemony leaning towards disability discrimination and signifying that the influence of traditional-intellectualism might just be on the periphery of organic-intellectualism. However, 2UCS provided management of his disability in the form of controlled workload as appropriate reasonable adjustments, which is an obligation designed within the legislation (Foster, 2007). He describes as follows:

> Initially the Uni-HR was hesitant to employ me because my disability is complicated to deal with. But once I explained everything, I was accommodated at work it was all good.

Sydnie, *Ann* and *Peter* felt high levels of inclusion, which demonstrated respect and valued their contributions. Therefore, 2UCS has managed to maintain the organic hegemonic ideology (Green, 1993), which is in line with the experiences of the disabled academic participants and the social model of disability. These data suggest that the hegemony at 2UCS is in line with the experiences of disabled academics and the social model of disability.

9.13 Theme 6 – Disability Policies and Practices

The policies at 2UCS indicate that it is necessary to involve disabled employees in maintaining E&D. As *Andie* notes:

> *Andie*: All protected staff groups are involved and represented on the various governance bodies, including disabled staff.

In order to observe equality at 2UCS, an employment survey is carried-out regularly, which is separate from the EIPMF suggested in the policies. This survey is done specifically with the disabled

employees to make the University more accessible. This employment survey helps in getting specified feedback and information about minor, but crucial issues like the use of toilets, etc.

> *Teresa*: We do a survey on employment experiences in the University [and] employment equality monitoring, asking about disability experiences from disabled-staff. Like, IT-accessibility, getting passed the doors - are they heavy and also any feedback they generally have. Giving feedback about small things such as taps in the toilet in different buildings and other issues on disability access. Results of the survey influence what actions will need to be taken.

2UCS appears to be going beyond simply complying with the legislation by adopting a proactive equality approach, maintaining a social model of disability. However, to further confirm this, the experiences of disabled academic participants are further examined below.

Sydnie is also included in developing activities that improve disability accessibility, she explains:

> So yes, I am involved in policy-making.

She continues explaining that she also needs to be careful about her involvement, reducing her visibility as an activist. This is because she fears that being too involved in policy-making at her workplace and fighting for change in policy without rest would/might affect her academic work-load and her health. Therefore, she feels she also needs to keep a distance.

Ann explained that she has been asked a number of times by the University and would appreciate being involved in policy-making. However, juggling between her academic teaching and her demanding family life does not allow her to take up any further extra work. Her loyalty with the University is so intense that she describes as follows:

> I have spent nine-years working in this Uni. Not once having support from outside, like help from the government or other organisation.

Ann also identified the importance of a proactive approach at 2UCS:

> In our University there is regular evaluation of policies (EIPMF) to check what's working and what's not.

Peter shares his experiences and organic knowledge of disability to assist the University with disability issues. For this purpose, he is involved in activities aimed at improving disability access within his own workplace, along with external agencies. He values this role and does it voluntarily. He explains as follows:

I feel responsible to provide consultation on disability policy.

It seems that most of the participants were involved in the processes of policy development at 2UCS, which is positive because disabled people's experiences are necessary in contributing advice to policy and practises in creating accessibility and inclusivity (Barton, 1993).

Involvement of disabled employees with policy-making is necessary, because they are the experts on disability, having organic knowledge to contribute to the development of disability equality. However, academic workload should be considered, because this involvement could be seen as additional work, for example in the case of *Ann* who is a disabled women, also having family-care responsibilities (Baruch and Hall, 2004, Schwartz, 2004). This is likely to be magnified for disabled academics when responsibility for disability equality is loaded on them.

9.14 Theme 7 - Training on Disability awareness

This section focusses on disability awareness training. The comments of HR managers are examined first before being compared to the experiences of disabled academics at 2UCS.

> *Andie*: The entire University, and all staff are required to complete Equality & Diversity training and workshops on a regular basis.
>
> *Bailey*: Awareness training for managers so they are aware of the reasonable adjustment or the potential someone can have in a workplace. The HR department provides training to new managers who are not aware of reasonable adjustment or the potential barriers someone can have.
>
> *Teresa*: For staff, there is training to review their own practices and adopt approaches that are inclusive. For managers there is training for understanding the importance of reasonable adjustments and to be aware of the advice and support services for disabled staff. I believe training and online training can help in eradicating conscious bias and bringing out biases some people have.

Although, on-line equality training seems to be limited and its effectiveness is still being questioned (Ohri, 2011, Noon, 2018), *Teresa* also suggested other inclusive methods of training like face-to-face training. To further investigate the effectiveness of improvements at 2UCS, the disabled academics participants' experiences are explored below.

Sydnie spoke about the importance of disability awareness training and its effects:

> It's the only way people can know about the disability and disabled people's needs.

She continues explaining that appropriate training can assist in changing people's attitudes and behaviours. This is because awareness occurs when there is physical interaction and experiences are shared with non-disabled people by disabled people themselves (Peterson and Quarstein, 2001). For example, how to speak to deaf people, what to do for blind readers and/or which coloured paper is best for dyslexic readers. Therefore, *Sydnie* suggests appropriate disability awareness training changes non-disable people's attitudes and behaviour towards disability (French, 1992).

Ann also passionately spoke about the importance of disability awareness training and its impact at 2UCS. Additionally, she also spoke about the 2UCS having online training, further verified by *Teresa*.

Peter explained the necessity of disability awareness training by giving an example of himself as an insight:

> People with ego, negative-outlook and their perception towards me is lacking confidence and trust, because they think 'he is disabled, how he is going to cope?' As a result, we have a barrier and this needs to be tackled. This is why there has to be awareness training.

Peter recognises that disability changes the way a disabled person is judged against normative standards of full-capacity (Campbell, 2009, Goodley, 2017). However, disability awareness training is aimed towards creating a positive assumption about disability for non-disabled employees and managers so that they can assist in effectively and efficiently supporting and encouraging disabled employees.

All three of the participants emphasised the importance of disability awareness training, because sharing disability experiences with non-disabled people provides disability awareness, rather than forming negative attitudes towards disability a result of social, environmental and attitudinal-barriers (Finkelstein, 1991). All felt it trains attitudes, subjective norms and perceived motivational behaviour to satisfy and encourage beliefs and perceptions of E&D (Wiethoff, 2004).

9.15 Theme 8 - Stigmatizing and Stereotyping

The employment policies at 2UCS aim for the eradication of disability stigmatizing and stereotyping. This point was emphasised by HR managers:

> *Andie*: Dignity of all employees is protected completely. For this purpose, policies are in place to get rid of stereotyping in the University.
>
> *Bailey*: Policies are put in place to protect employees from discrimination. Strict action is taken for harming self-respect of others.

The above statements are validated by the disabled academic participants below.

Sydnie felt her experiences as a student, when she was unable to pursue her choice of specialization, was associated with stigma and stereotype (Corrigan et al., 2003).

> I did my postgraduate I wanted to choose a subject of my own choice but my university played the disability card and underestimated me.

Stigmatization and stereotyping continued to make her feel devalued and worthless (Schneider, 2005), because historically having a disability gave rise to negative labelling and embarrassment (Stone et al., 1992). However, after sustaining her employment and the support provided at 2UCS, she realized her self-worth and value (Major and O'Brien, 2005). Therefore, the supportive work-environment encouraged her to progress forward in her career.

Throughout the OH narratives of the disabled academic participants it is highlighted that 2UCS is supportive towards its disabled employees, which is essential in eradicating stigma and stereotype. To support this *Ann* describes as follows:

> I am lucky to have a good system and for me I am lucky not to have been stigmatised or labelled. University provides full awareness training for us (she means employees at 2UCS and not particularly herself). Provides updates of the changing law, policies, etc. on disability. Recently, they helped me with getting a disability car that has been a huge help to me.

Ann continues explaining that she thought she would never be able to get employment as an academic. Fortunately, the underestimation of society challenged her to pursue counter-stigmatising beliefs of people regarding disability and employment (Thomson, 1997, Laclau and Mouffe, 2001).

As a qualified disability advisor, *Peter* offers consultation and training services on disability awareness. In these services, he needs to encourage his participants not to feel defeated because of the social stigma and stereotype created towards disability (Schneider, 2005). He also gives his own example as follows:

> For me I didn't want to be left behind, so I pursued studying. People think if you are disabled you can't do anything. So, I felt I need to tackle the barriers and negative views by showing I am useful in society. So yes, having a good job and having a PhD proves a testament that we can achieve and strive, we are not a burden.

Peter did not permit disability stigmatization or stereotyping to discourage his professional aspirations or did not distance and nullify himself. Instead he challenged himself to abolish disability discrimination, which he is now successfully managing to do at 2UCS.

All of the disabled academic participants acknowledged that some degree of stigma and stereotyping is still present in society (Clapton et al., 2005). Although, 2UCS is highly supportive towards its disabled employees, disability discrimination still exists, due to the negative attitudes and behaviour of non-disabled people in society (Barnes, 1997b) and therefore challenging it is an on-going project. It seems that *Sydnie*, *Ann* and *Peter* were successful in liberating themselves by challenging the stigma and stereotyping of disability (Whittington-Walsh, 2002), translating into good-sense, provided by their organic intellectualism (Gramsci, 1971b).

9.16 Conclusion

This Chapter offers a detailed understanding and analysis of 2UCS. The beginning of this Chapter focuses on the analysis of the policies, suggesting that it complies with the EqA, also advancing further to promote and value its employees. According to the policies, 2UCS is demonstrating responsibility for providing utmost support towards its disabled academics. In addition, the short academic work history outlines of the disabled academic participants assist in locating their roles as a traditional or organic-intellectual.

The 2UCS portrays a very positive and proactive organic disability hegemony both its policy and the attitude of its HR managers. The data suggest that the power to exercises regulations and practices is influenced by organic-intellectualism, supported by the positive experiences of the disabled academic participants. For example, *Peter* is provided with not just straight-forward reasonable adjustments on paper, but every day a person is assigned to take him to his lecture hall. This thread runs through all of the disabled academic participants' narratives at 2UCS. Therefore, there is not much space or requirement for a counter-hegemony. Furthermore, the high level of disabled academic involvement in policy-making and the obvious organic-intellectualism provided by the disabled academics participants has contributed to the organic ideology. Therefore, creating a common-view of the organic-ideology, which reflects the social model, at the University.

10.0 Chapter Ten: Analysis of three University case-study

10.1 Introduction

The third University case-Study (3UCS) is rated as 'world-leading' and 'internationally excellent' in demonstrating research practises (REF, 2014). The University is an 'elite university' and contributes to society through its education, learning and research. It has more than 18,000 students and nearly 9,000 employees from all over the world (HESA, 2016).

10.2 Policies and Practises

The 3UCS accommodates employees from diverse backgrounds, proposing a commitment towards E&D, which assists encouraging awareness, tolerance, employment-development, employee commitment and maintains an inclusive culture to all protected-characteristics. The details of these commitments are contained within the University policies, known as the Equal Opportunities Policy (EOP) and the Combined Equality Scheme (CES). The EOP is concerned with equal opportunities, valuing diversity, supporting, promoting and encouraging an inclusive workplace environment. The EOP is accompanied by the CES, incorporating the equality objectives outcomes, setting out the legal duties and equality strategies in relation to the protected characteristics. The 3UCS also has an E&D Committee, ensuring the implementation of equality activities through its policies and practices, consistent with fulfilling the EqA legal responsibilities. Indeed, the policies are heavily influenced by the legislation at 3UCS, suggesting legal compliance approach to E&D (Aplin and Hegarty, 1980). In accordance with the PSED 3UCS regularly publishes its equality objectives and equality information, which is publicly available on the University website from which it was ascertained that there are 1348 disabled students and 325 disabled employees.

A good example of being influenced by the legislation is that the language used in the EOP, such as: The objective of working towards eliminating discrimination, harassment, and victimisation …. protected ….'. Many of the words are taken directly from the EqA section 149, with a few embellishments to personalize it. Copy and pasting policy wording from legislation may be aimed at protecting 3UCS from any illegality during the process of policy-making. It also suggests that justice is envisioned as fairness and equal opportunities for all its employees, because the EqA also observes a liberal equality approach (Geffen, 2013).

Table 10.1 Equality Policies at 3UCS

Policy	Objective	Duties
EOP (Equal-opportunities Policy)	Concerned with improving E&D, i.e. valuing diversity, supporting, promoting and encouraging an inclusive workplace environment. Encourages employees' engagement in the promotion of equality activities.	Responsible for implementing equal opportunities among its employees. Preventing discrimination, harassment and victimisation.
CES (Combined Equality Scheme)	Concerned with Equality objectives outcomes, setting out the legal duties and equality strategies, towards the protected-characteristics.	Responsible for incorporating and implementing strategies developed through outcomes of the EOP.
D&EP (Disability and Employment Policy)	Concerned with maximising accessibility, for example, encouraging employees' disability disclosure, ensuring implementation of reasonable-adjustments, etc.	Responsible for ensuring that policies, systems, procedures, facilities, services and buildings in compliance with the EqA. For example, providing disability services for disabled and prospective disabled employees.

At the 3UCS the Disability and Employment Policy (D&EP) is a specific policy for assisting disabled employees and claims to observe the social model. However, it also proclaims to follow the legislation, aspects of which follow the medical model (Oliver, 1986, Morris, 2013, Geffen, 2013), again suggesting a liberal equality approach. Professing to follow the social model whilst implementing a medical model is likely to cause an unclear and ambiguous gap between the D&EP and its effective implementation (Hoque and Noon, 2004, Rainbird et al., 2011, Malika, 2011). For example, the policy of implementing reasonable adjustments at 3UCS is influenced by the EqA, stating that the disabled employee needs to be at a *substantial disadvantage* compared to a non-disabled employee before the employer needs to implement reasonable adjustments to avoid the disadvantage. The adjustments focus on the employee's bodily impairment, rather, than on the disabling work environment. Therefore, the employer is only required to react to an individual's medical situation, doing the minimum to avoid barriers and not removing them. However, a radical approach to equality, incorporating a social model of disability, would require removing all barriers, regardless of being disabled or non-disabled (Finkelstein, 2001b). Taking this minimalist approach to reasonable adjustments can lead to their inappropriate installation, causing discrimination and disadvantage, usually due to the unclear understanding of the managers and/or the line-managers or even the HR-department (Foster, 2007, Fevre et al., 2013, Schur et al., 2013). To further investigate this situation, *Bamboos* the HR manager was interviewed. The experiences related to

disability equality and the practical implementation of these policies have been captured through the disabled academic participants' OH, below.

10.3 OH outlines of disabled academics at 3UCS

The following table gives a summary of the four disabled academic participants at 3UCS. They have different disabilities, belonging to various subjects of academia at 3UCS.

Table 10.2 OH Academic Descriptions of Disabled Academic Participants at 3UCS

Name of Disabled academic.	*Type of Disability.*	*Academic Subject.*	*OH*-dialogue *time.*	*OH*-dialogue *location.*
Lawrence	Partially deaf and Autism	Mathematics	3.5 hours	Academic's office
Mandy (PhD researcher)	Bipolar Disorder	Biology	1.5 hour	Staff Room
Suzie	Multiple sclerosis MS	Sociology	3.5 hours	Academic's office
Walt	Deaf and Partially blind	Zoology	4 hours	Academic's office

10.4 Lawrence:

Lawrence's age is between 55 and 65 years. He is autistic which makes social interaction with people difficult for him causing problems at work (Wing, 1992). He is a mathematician and statistician at 3UCS. He is also involved in other academic IT tasks, like teaching development of computing languages and practical software engineering of high-performance scientific computers. He considers his disability an advantage towards his academic learning and teaching in computing and mathematics.

> I have autism which helps me understand technical things, but I am not good at politically negotiating with people, depriving me from independence at 3UCS

Lawrence is a great supporter of disability disclosure and also encourages people to disclose their disability at their workplace for their own benefit and protection (Rocco, 2001). Although he has disclosed his disability, he feels he has experienced much discrimination by the University. He also suggested that, in order to be supportive towards anti-bullying, anti-discrimination and anti-victimisation, political bureaucracy needs to be eradicated at 3UCS, because it has made the University policies and practises confusing and complicated (Cheng et al., 2002).

Lawrence concluded that discrimination should be tackled from a grass-roots level arguing that those creating hegemonic power structures within organisations, need to be educated about disability awareness by disabled employees (Faubion, 1994). His attitude resonated with the concept of 'nothing about us without us' (Charlton, 1998: title) and understanding disabled people's liberation and emancipation (Oliver and Barnes, 2008), signifying *Lawrence* as a good example of an organic-intellectual.

10.5 Mandy:

Mandy's age is between, 30 and 40 years. Currently, she is at the beginning of her academic employment doing a PhD in Biology. She has a mental health condition and identifies her disability as fluctuating.

> It has been three years into my PhD since diagnosed, it has been a struggle and I have to realise that I will not have that full health. My condition is invisible.

She is a private person and does not like to talk about her disability. Therefore, she prefers to manage her disability by managing her fatigue levels, which meant taking six months' time-off from her PhD.

After returning from her PhD interruption, she needed to re-register back into her PhD, which was one of the biggest barriers she experienced at 3UCS. The perception was that there is not much support provided for disabled PhD researchers at 3UCS and there is a lack of awareness and professional guidance towards disability. For example, after *Mandy* informed the University about her disability her supervisor did not know how to handle this situation. *Mandy* took time-off, however, applying for this absence from 3UCS was extremely troublesome and unnecessarily time consuming, making her feel incompetent and lonely (Olney and Brockelman, 2003).

Simultaneously, *Mandy* felt 3UCS wanted her to finish on time, so they would not have to deal with issues of having a disabled researcher. So, she fought for her rights, which was worth the effort, not only for herself but challenging the hegemony, helping to ensure that such future treatment will not re-occur with future disabled PhD researchers. As a result, 3UCS have provided *Mandy* with a new study area and more time to finish her PhD. Clearly, she demonstrated herself as an emerging organic-intellectual and highlights that it is crucial to recognize the voices of disabled PhD researchers as they are being trained to become potential future academics employees (Oliver and Barnes, 1997a, Jacobs, 2010).

10.6 Suzie:

Suzie's age is between 25 and 35. She has Multiple Sclerosis (MS) and is employed by the department of Public Health at 3UCS as a junior academic, focussing on ethical, social and legal implications of dementia in the UK.

From a young age, *Suzie* has been interested in different ways technology could inform disabilities related to mental health. This is because many of her family members suffered from mental health related issues, which encouraged *Suzie* to complete a doctorate on dementia and its social implications on society. She was fit and healthy at the beginning of her PhD, however, sometimes she would experience muscle stiffness. After seeing her doctor, she discovered that she suffers from some serious spinal problems, which may affect her physical bodily functions.

> After a few months, my walking became difficult. It was very hard to concentrate and to articulate myself. People also observed I was noticeably different.

Then she was taken to a neurologist, who hospitalized her straight away, the doctors were uncertain about her medical condition. She was told that she might be developing a disability and there was an 85% chance that this would affect her bodily functions, like walking, talking, etc. Within 8 months *Suzie's* productivity towards her PhD started to decrease. She had three options: 1) temporarily suspend doing her PhD, which meant temporarily stopping her funding/income for that period; 2) she could go part-time, reducing her funding/income, meaning she would have to seek other paid work; 3) continue with her PhD, which she opted for. Continuing with her PhD made her feel pressured, but she did not want to let down her University. This impacted *Suzie* by considering giving up her PhD research. However, after much negotiation and struggle, she did manage to complete her PhD, which took her 4 years and 8 months stating "My PhD has been a rollercoaster".

Suzie demonstrated the attributes of an organic-intellectual, because of her persistent and challenging dealings with the funding body of her PhD research. Her tenacity made them realize that provision of physical requirements is not enough to complete an academic research. In fact, other reasonable adjustments like time length for completing academic research needs to be considered.

10.7 Walt:

Walt's age is between 70 and 80 years. He became partially deaf when he was a child during the Second World War and became partially blind in 2012, due to old age. He has been employed at 3UCS, for more than 50 years as a senior academic. His research work is much appreciated and his academic contributions continue to bring in much financial benefit to the University.

> The University doesn't let me go. Instead, every couple of years the department of my area renews my contract, I continue to do research. Last year I published my 556th article!"

Walt describes that he was always fascinated by insects. "As a child I would collect worms and caterpillars in empty jam-jars and my mother would call my collection Walt's Museum". He graduated as an ecologist in 1962, worked as a medical entomologist in Belize and Cameroon. During the 1970s he wrote a two-volume handbook on the British insect species, creating a stir internationally among biologists and entomologists.

> I got funding to publish everything about flies, it received a lot of praises internationally, had 176 hits.

In the 1970s, his international reputation secured him an academic job at 3UCS, since then he has been working as an academic in the department of Zoology.

He thoroughly enjoys working at 3UCS and cannot imagine himself not working as an academic. 3UCS never stopped or discouraged him from his work, due to his disability. In fact, he was encouraged to work with assistance and was provided a more spacious work area. It seems that he enjoys facilitated management, due to his experience and seniority level. Although, on the surface *Walt* seems to adhere to the concept of an organic intellectual, but due to his academic accomplishments he is already a winner in the hegemonic ideology.

10.8 Interpretation and Presentation of Interview Dialogues

In this section a comparison of the documentary policy analysis at 3UCS is compiled, using the interview responses from participants. This includes semi-structured interview comments of the HR manager *Bamboos* and the OH of four disabled academics participants. In summary, the interview with *Bamboos* was an enhanced version of the policies and practices stated in theory. When asked about the application of reasonable adjustments, a concise, but inadequate answer was given.

3UCS is one of the oldest, historical and heritage-site universities in England and the disabled academic participants did complain about the physical structure of some of the buildings, which they felt needed to be more disabled-friendly. However, *Bamboos* praised the disability policies and practises, saying; "In terms of the policies, we are happy with them as we believe we are doing a good job". He also explained that disabled applicants and employees are welcomed and well-supported at 3UCS. These claims shall be further investigated below through the OH of the disabled academic participants, because investigation of practises is possible only through interactive conversation (Heritage and Clayman, 2011).

10.9 Theme 1 - Being an academic with disabilities

In summary of the disability policies *Bamboos*, the HR manager at 3UCS, stated the following:

> We try to accommodate providing necessary equipment, resources and/or facilities. We do yearly risk assessments, where we observe and give recommendations to improve the learning and teaching environments, and the accessibility of the University.

Demonstrating that 3UCS has a very technical and legal compliance approach towards disability equality. Unfortunately, this statement does not depict any feeling of empathy, in fact seems to suggest a hegemony that has been forcefully driven. Although, on the surface the above statement sounds like 3UCS is extremely accessible and welcoming towards its disabled academics, after listening to the disabled academic participants' OH a different, organic, version of reality emerges:

Lawrence talked about the ways in which his disability and the disability of others impact the academic environment at the University. He also continued explaining the process of disability management and its adverse effects on disabled academics. For example, he felt that his requests to deliver lectures in an accessible environment were not taken seriously. He explains as follows:

> I am severely deaf, wear hearing-aids at all times. I am worried if the hearing-loop is not tested regularly or not working in the lecture theatre or seminar room, my teaching goes to waste.

These concerns cause *Lawrence* severe reduction in confidence and energy levels, preventing him from allocating-time and energy towards other academic tasks. This conflict between normative work practices and his requirements as a disabled academic confirms Shakespeare's (2006a) argument that work practices are located in assumed non-disability, affecting disabled people's ability to be accommodated. The inconsistency with *Bamboos's* statement about the smooth-running of the policies and *Lawrence's* experience of the practice leaves him demotivated and exhausted. He explains:

> During teaching I have to REMEMBER to tell students to come in front of the class to ensure everyone can hear my voice and minimise any noise in the lecture room.

This provision of inadequate accommodation, demonstrates lack of understanding towards disability requirements (Shakespeare, 2006b). However, *Lawrence* has needed to compensate for the University's inconsistency, enforcing a self-check routine, which involves ensuring that he is well-heard in the classroom. This extra effort makes *Lawrence* feel tired, frustrated and resentful, as this

time could be utilized towards the content of the lecture. He is also concerned that his experience is common to other disabled academics at 3UCS. For example, he says:

> They have been thoroughly uncooperative, discriminatory and when raised the issue they just say YOU are being difficult. This is a very common experience among disabled academics in this University.

The experience was certainly common amongst the other participants.

Mandy, is doing a PhD, identified her disability as fluctuating, reducing her capacity to work. She is unable to predict her ability to work in advance, therefore, operates on a day-to-day basis. She has learned to manage her disability herself by managing her fatigue levels, which means taking significant time off from her PhD research. In doing so, she allocates her time and energy to other work tasks. However, repeated absences from her PhD makes her feel incompetent and lonely. She explains:

> My disability is a slight barrier, some-days I wake-up and I know I cannot continue with my experiment in the lab. So, I had to learn how to work around my disability by taking time-off. This has been difficult, feeling is very isolating.

Mandy feels she receives no assistance from 3UCS in this respect, demonstrating an inconsistency with the policies and the statement provided by *Bamboos*. The lack of support left *Mandy* to discover her own coping mechanism, which was very exhausting and time-consuming. Unfortunately, the lack of professional guidance left a negative impact, making her feel inferior, helpless, emotional and detached (Samuels, 2003) from 3UCS. She explains as follows:

> No help from the uni so I took time-off, which stopped me from progressing.

To reduce the feeling of regression and being a nuisance, *Mandy* developed her own strategies to manage and adapt herself to her disability, which turned out to be non-beneficial (Gignac et al., 2000). She explains:

> I have had to learn how to adapt my structure of work, so some-days I would be fine and other days I know I will not accomplish much due to how I feel. This did not help. I am worried my PhD won't be good enough as I am not in a well state of being.

Mandy was left dealing with her disability herself, which made her feel isolated and left her doubtful about becoming an academic (Oliver and Barnes, 1997a).

Suzie also acquired her disability while she was doing her PhD. Her disability significantly affects her energy levels, leaving her exhausted. Currently, she is employed as a junior academic at the 3UCS. She is confident at the moment that her strategies for managing her disability, like taking regular breaks and using appropriate equipment to support her body-posture has assisted with continuing her professional academic-life.

Suzie also strategized her disability, ensuring that it does not negatively impact her academic work. Simultaneously, she was also cautious of not being a burden on the University as a newly employed disabled academic. She says:

> I think learning how to work, walking, managing myself strategically. At the moment, the work I am doing at present is taking a lot of my energy, creating a strategy to deal with my disability at work. For example, I know if I am working at a computer screen for too long, I'll struggle to stand up, so I have to make sure to take breaks.

To overcome her fatigue, *Suzie* devised her own strategies like taking short breaks during the day, rather than longer, more visible absences, like *Mandy*.

Walt's age-related disability is common and therefore possibly more socially accepted (Boehm and Dwertmann, 2015). *Walt* enjoys his academic work thoroughly and is considered to be a valuable asset to 3UCS, but like the other academics, he has self-managed his disability. Being an ingenious person, he figured out a clever, speedy, inexpensive and effective approach towards managing his disability. He explains as follows:

> I need things to be magnified, so I dismantled a broken pair of binoculars and made an eye-piece for my eyes to use for reading and researching.

Walt was an extremely satisfied and respected disabled academic at his University. This was because his work was highly appreciated by his University colleagues and employers. Becoming disabled at an old-age can be less stressful for some academics, in comparison to someone who is already disabled when beginning their employment, like *Lawrence* at 3UCS. *Walt* was a well-established and lucrative academic providing many benefits to 3UCS, therefore the University was eager to accommodate his needs despite his old-age.

It is interesting that *Lawrence*, *Mandy, Suzie* and *Walt* are disabled academics, but all have different experiences. According to *Bamboos* and the policy analysis, maximum support is provided towards performance and achieving excellence of disabled academics. However, this is not the experience of most of the participants, suggesting that 3UCS has an ableist perspective that is masked by

compliance underlying their hegemony. For example, *Lawrence's* case demonstrates that, at 3UCS, it is common-sense to understand that everybody can hear, whereas good-sense only extends to the compliance of having hearing-loops installed and not ensuring their maintenance. It would be good-sense to take the on-going disability needs into consideration (Barnes and Oliver, 1998) and check all disability related equipment, like hearing-loops regularly.

10S.10 Theme 2 – Employment progression

3UCS's policies promise support towards employment progression of its disabled academics, which is further investigated through the HR manager's interview comments below:

> *Bamboos*: Regardless of disability, if the person has the skill-set and ability they should apply and do the job. Yes, having disabled employees helps improve the teaching and learning environment and University accessibility.

Furthermore, *Bamboos* also spoke about strategies developed by 3UCS to encourage and develop disabled academic employees' employment:

> The University takes active steps to promote good practices. We have built very impressive robust networks of consultative forums; our disability network attracts employees. It is clear that there are opportunities for everyone to be involved in achieving the University's core values.

According to *Bamboos*, 3UCS understands the importance of having disabled academics as it helps in developing and introducing new styles of teaching and learning, creating awareness, which is an important aspect of organizational learning (Robinson, 2013). It seems that the aim of 3UCS is to develop a business case by using the knowledge of disabled academics at the same time by delivering benefits to them. Such a proclamation, shall be further investigated below, through the disabled academic participants' OH.

Lawrence feels his disability has adversely impacted his academic work because he can only focus and research on limited areas, causing him much intellectual restriction. He says:

> Mathematics and statistics, I can comprehend, due to my disability.

Although, *Lawrence* is privileged to instantly grasp the knowledge of certain subjects due to his disability, being a disabled academic makes him feel like an 'outsider'. It is the assumption that an ideal worker should be strong and healthy (Weber, 1964, Acker, 1990, Bedeian, 2007, Foster and Wass, 2013). This creates an inherent ableism, where unseen processes of academic life, such as

patronage and politics, reinforce the ableist hegemony (Foster, 2007) at the University. Furthermore, disabled employees are neglected as being a 'minority' having a protected-characteristic (Foster and Wass, 2013) and overlooked for employment progression. *Lawrence* explains as follows:

> Currently, no one at this University can go further than a post-doc unless they are politically clever. You might get the odd professors, but they could never be part of the establishment. I refrain from playing politics or political negotiating.

This makes *Lawrence* feel his academic progression is stalled (Uppal, 2005). He further explains as follows:

> My promotion has been prevented. There has been discussion where people with disabilities should not be stopped. But the end results are there is a vast amount of discrimination occurring.

Lawrence found 3UCS significantly lacking equal opportunities, making him feel extremely marginalized, demonstrating, a contradiction between *Bamboos's* statement and *Lawrence's* experience.

Despite feeling isolated, *Lawrence* was not alone in this experience. *Mandy* expected a lot of assistance regarding her academic career. However, due to the rising intensity of her disability she had to take time-off, which was harmful towards her developing academic career. She says:

> The University underestimated my potential to complete my PhD. Although I was determined to complete my studies, but the condition forced me to take two terms off from studies which have been a barrier in my life as I have to stop and re-start my studies which has been disruptive.

The difficulties she encountered made her feel as if her advancement within academia is being prevented (Wilson-Kovacs et al., 2008). Such an experience conflicts with the hegemony created by *Bamboos's* version of disability progression. Underneath a thin veneer of liberal equality of opportunity, it seems that traditional views of ableism are the hegemonic ideology at the University.

Suzie did not talk about her current employment progression at 3UCS, but instead spoke about her past experience. For example, she describes one of her experiences during her PhD studies:

> Funding bodies were not sympathetic and did not give an extension because they considered providing the equipment is enough, without realizing that it supported me but did not make me do my work faster.

Similar to *Lawrence* and *Mandy*, *Suzie* felt as if her academic employment progression was hindered due to the lack of consideration of potential employment gatekeepers in academia. They also seem to inhabit the ablest hegemony and do not understand the nature of disabilities (Williams and Mavin, 2015).

Walt's academic work is internationally valued, bringing benefit to 3UCS in the form of large amounts of funding, thus creating a strong business case for his adjustments (PacifiCorp, 2013). Although he recognises his disability effects his academic-work, he avoids unnecessary tasks that would exhaust him. However, his continuous success and academic achievements have facilitated the maximum assistance and accommodation from the University. He explains as follows:

> I am severely disabled and seventy-six years old. I excel at my work never had trouble with employment progression. If you are productive they support you.

Walt never felt unsupported by 3UCS, which resonates with *Bamboos* statement. However, his experience is not consistent with that of *Lawrence* and *Mandy*. For example, *Lawrence* suggested that one needs to be 'politically clever' to progress in academic employment. However, *Lawrence* lacks this component within his personality, due to his disability (KarenIllingworth, 2005), which made him feel discriminated (Pfeffer, 1992). Whereas *Walt,* being well established in his academic employment, shone in his academic work, enjoying the support and assistance provided to him by the University as a result (Goffee and Jones, 2007). This suggests that discrimination is contingent on socially accepted forms of disability, like age related disability and other issues of labour market power, therefore, limiting employment opportunities (Shah, 2005).

10.11 Theme 3 – Disability disclosure

Voluntary disability disclosure is encouraged by 3UCS at any employment stage. According to *Bamboos*, 3UCS is an inclusive University, benefiting the disabled academics' needs and requirements and disability disclosure is not to be feared. He explains as follows:

> Some people rule themselves out of disclosure, they feel if they disclose will not be treated well, which is a wrong presumption. They are afraid of discrimination, but we welcome employees and help them with their situation.

Lawrence explains the necessity of disclosing his disability, helping his employers understand and provide an accessible workplace. In the words of *Lawrence*:

> A lot of people do not disclose because they are afraid of not being employed, but for visible and extreme disability they are always disclosed for obvious reasons. I have always disclosed mine.

The employer should be unbiased, interested in obtaining employment benefits from the disabled employee (von Schrader et al., 2014), thereby, avoiding the negativity of disclosure. To get full support from the University, *Lawrence* has disclosed his disability. However, according to the EqA candidates for jobs no longer have to disclose medical conditions on their application. Many disabled employees are not comfortable in disclosing their invisible disabilities, because disclosure may result in inappropriate accommodation leading to stigmatization in the workplace and even dismissal.

Mandy, described her experience of disability disclosure at 3UCS, which certainly negated *Bamboos* statement. For *Mandy*, returning to her PhD work after becoming disabled, disclosure was an arduous journey. She informed her supervisor who immediately showed support. However 3UCS showed no support or provision of reasonable adjustments to accommodate *Mandy's* requirements initially:

> My disability is invisible. In the eyes of the University I am disabled now and I have the right to ask for reasonable adjustments. But I had to fight for more time for my PhD, consulting independent legal agencies to make sure I wasn't being discriminated. This was very time-consuming and difficult. Asking for extra time and new study work space. After such an experience no one would be encouraged to disclose their disability.

Due to the invisibility of *Mandy's* disability it was difficult to convince the management at 3UCS to provide reasonable adjustment, which led to frustration and unnecessary time consumption (Fitzgerald, 2000). After experiencing such difficulties, she questions the value of declaration and a subsequent need to request flexible working-arrangements, which may have a negative impact upon her academic employment prospects. Now she feels suspicious and ambiguous about declaring her disability after her experience at 3UCS.

Lawrence is concerned and anxious, whereas *Mandy* has already experienced discrimination with concerns about loss or renegotiation of reasonable accommodation. Such practises immediately lead people to believe that their disability is a disadvantage (Lowton, 2004) producing substantial negative outcomes (Bishop, 2002) and does not resonate with *Bamboos's* statement.

From a different position of power, *Walt* also sees disclosure as a means of self-preservation by requesting reasonable adjustments. It is crucial to ensure he can maintain his health and well-being, because work overload can exacerbate disability (Harlan and Robert, 1998).

> As soon as I informed them about my blindness, they have provided with a special computer.

Furthermore, he says that not declaring may limit access to reasonable adjustments:

> Encourage disability disclosure, because the University can help the disabled academics, there are so many aids for help.

All the disabled academic participants described the importance of disability disclosure, leading to more dignity and respect (Hatfield, 2005). Disclosure can lead to inclusive organizing practices which help in the provision of reasonable adjustments, promoting integration and participation (Lucas, 2008). However, *Mandy's* experience suggests a lack of trust and concern, over her declaration and the consequential impact upon her academic employment. Thus, where there is low trust, disclosure can prompt hesitancy and concern in decisions on declaration, particularly when the disability is invisible and non-declaration is a viable option (Brunner, 2007). Such situations suggest that non-disability is the norm, preferable by default, thereby becoming the hegemonic ideology. At 3UCS there is a need to understand the importance of employment relations regarding the complexity of disability disclosure (Allaire, 2004, Goldberg et al., 2005).

10.12 Theme 4 - Provision of help/support and reasonable adjustments

This section contains disabled academic participants' experiences of negotiating or applying for help/support and reasonable adjustments at 3UCS, highlighting the effective or problematic issues. Following an analysis of the HR manager's perceptions about the reasonable adjustments policy, *Bamboos* explained that 3UCS is open towards listening and making changes to advice and recommendations suggested by disabled employees:

> We ensure to meet and recheck the academic employee's needs, we aim to tackle problems, i.e. the location of work, the hours and also the equipment they require. We ensure to listen to disabled people's needs and implement recommendations.

This positive portrayal of practice at 3UCS is compared with the disabled academic participants' OH, suggesting a different experience of the provision of help/support and reasonable adjustments.

Lawrence explained the painstaking bureaucratic process of applying for support or reasonable adjustments, which places the onus for activity on the disabled academic (Befort, 2015). He explains as follows:

> The University provides the support, but we have to push very hard, questioning and negotiating. Finally, we get them.

Disabled academics are the experts on their disability in that they best know about their requirements (Brisenden, 1986a). However, applying for reasonable accommodation should not be an additional burdened responsibility. *Lawrence* states:

> Listen to the disabled person's needs, instead of telling them that you can do this and that. You are not disabled so you don't know.

It is good-practise to provide the disabled employee the opportunity to describe their disability needs and requirement as they are the best knowers of their disability (Williams-Whitt and Taras, 2010, Oliver et al., 2012).

Lawrence also said that employers should not focus on the employee's disability (Morrell, 1990). Instead, they should provide the type of support their employees need to work effectively (Oliver, 1990a).

Mandy described the resistance she faced from 3UCS when, after a disability related absence, she attempted to re-join her PhD. She explained:

> I had to fill out many forms, like the doctors and so on for different departments, which was difficult, coming back from sick-leave to prove that I am healthy and fit to continue. I had to go for interviews and to visit medical clinics and health advisors to get their approval to confirm I am deemed fit and healthy to return to University. I feel this is not the right culture, me fighting to be at this University. The ethos should be more supportive rather than confrontational, me vs. them rather us being together. There is a sense of separation, division, isolation, which I found very difficult.

Mandy experienced her return as confrontational, consisting of too much bureaucracy and leaving her feel unsupported, disillusioned, vulnerable and having little control over what was happening (Foster, 2007). Reflecting on this experience she says:

> The infrastructure needs to be put in place to support us. A centralised system were all departments could coordinate together.

Suzie also shares her experience of doing a PhD, just before her academic employment at 3UCS:

> I felt a lot of pressure, for example, informing the funders about my disability needs. I had voice-audio-software with my digital recorder, at this time I didn't have any movement in my left hand. But I was questioned why do I need this? I felt I would never ask anything if I didn't need it. Even when I had a taxi coming to pick me up, I was told to retain a receipt for each journey to claim the money-back. At times, the taxi drivers were awful and difficult to deal with.

She also explained that, keeping track of transport receipts was just one of the examples of tackling excessive amounts of bureaucracy, leaving her feeling mistrusted and reluctant when asking for further reasonable adjustments (Foster, 2007).

> They should first understand and then provide the required needs/funding for disabled academics. I felt I wasn't well supported and the funds were there for the equipment, but the expectations were to work faster. I felt there was a miss-match with the support of disability as it didn't meet my requirements.

Suzie was expected to work in the same way as other non-disabled academics after the provision of reasonable adjustments (Deegan, 2000, Barnes and Mercer, 2005), highlighting a lack of understanding disability support and demonstrating a waste of reasonable adjustments (Oliver, 1996b). The poor management of facilities and failure to understand disabled academic's access requirements when applying for reasonable adjustments was an issue in researching this thesis and is covered in Chapter Seven.

Through the experiences of *Lawrence*, *Mandy* and *Suzie*, it is clear that work levels could be maintained through appropriate guidance and workplace accommodations (Foster and Wass, 2013). However, they faced difficulties in applying and negotiating for reasonable adjustments, including failure to understand disability appropriately, mismanagement and implementation of reasonable adjustments (MacArthur et al., 2015). This does not coincide with *Bamboos's* positive portrayal of policies. Instead much stress and tension was experienced by disabled academic employees (Foster, 2007). The traditional hegemony of ableism was the norm in practice, which stood in the way of making a transition towards good-sense. Suggesting that the superficial provision of help, support and reasonable adjustments is not enough. Behaviours and attitudes of employers/managers are also crucial to change this traditional hegemony, which shall be further investigated and discussed below.

10.13 Theme 5 - Attitudes of Employer/Managers

This section examines the HR manager's views on appropriate employer attitudes to disability at 3UCS and compares these to the disabled academic participants' experiences of management behaviour.

Bamboos was very confident in stating the following:

> We focus on the ability of the disabled employees. If there are complaints or suggestions, we listen and try our best to solve and apply them.

Although 3UCS seems to be an accommodating and inclusive workplace, most of the disabled academic participants found management attitudes towards implementing reasonable adjustments discriminative.

Lawrence's narrative was particularly characterized by having a strained relationship with 3UCS's management. *Lawrence* provided an example of this when he was asked to move to an office that was inaccessible for wheelchair users. Although he is not a wheelchair user, he was concerned for others:

> My manager forced me and I said I'll not work here as this is disability discrimination. I was called a hassle. Disabled employees at 3UCS have all experienced discrimination.

As an activist for disability, *Lawrence* felt demotivated, having little control over what was happening (Appelbaum et al., 2007). His organic-intellectualism meant that he not only saw the implications for his own disability, but also the disability of others. However, in comparison to *Bamboos's* view that the critical input of disabled academics was actually sought, *Lawrence* felt his interventions were interpreted as him being a trouble-causer by non-disabled managers (Oliver, 1990b). This was particularly disconcerting when the policy at 3UCS suggests that disabled academics should not expect such negative attitudes and poor-behaviour from managers.

After *Mandy* returned back from her six months interruption, her PhD supervisor handled the transition smoothly. However, 3UCS created much trouble in accepting her back as a continuing PhD academic, leaving her unsupported and vulnerable. This poor transition back into work left *Mandy* disillusioned and worried about her future academic prospects:

> My PhD supervisor was listening and ready to help me with my problems, but the University was not helpful at all, refused to listen. They suggested I should get no extra time so I get closure and move on with my life. But doing this would have made me submit a bad piece of

> work. I fought for my right and although it was stressful and challenging and time consuming. But I didn't lose hope!

Mandy's account reflects that 3UCS lacks understanding of formal disability management or it hides behind the formality of compliance (common-sense) and does not understand organic disability management (good-sense). Although, her return was managed informally by her PhD supervisor, 3UCS refused to understand her circumstances and refused to accommodate reasonable alterations (Oliver and Barnes, 1997a). Interestingly, *Mandy* distinguishes between the direct management of her supervisor and the 'arm's-length' impersonal management of bureaucratic rules. Therefore, on the surface the University practises and policies aim to help disabled academics, however, there is much institutionalised disability discrimination taking place under the surface.

Suzie's disability further deteriorated following inappropriate management application of reasonable accommodation from her funding body after developing her disability. Instead, of being supportive towards her disability, the inflexibility of the research funding body pressurized her, which instigated stress and caused her further fatigue and thereby created an inaccessible and non-inclusive work environment (Namatovu et al., 2012):

> Get it done or go-away! I was given all the equipment to help me, but the funding bodies hurried me to finish, which was exhaustive and worsened my disability.

Suzie's experience is the result of a managerial assumption that reasonable adjustments 'cure' disability and once applied, there should be no further or extra consideration of disability, because now the disabled academic has been fully compensated and should be judged only on merit (Oliver, 1990b). These views have similarities with the liberal opportunities approach to equality, where removing barriers to create an even playing-field in which everyone can be treated the same and contribute to the misinterpretation and misunderstanding of disability (Liff and Wajcman, 1996).

By comparison, *Walt's* status and contribution shielded him from the poor management of his disability and he was therefore content and satisfied with the way he was approached by 3UCS's management:

> I had ability and productivity that's why the University never had an issue with my disability. When I became disabled the University was concerned about my health and safety and provided help.

Generally, Higher Education in the UK adopts a hierarchical structure among its academic employees (Oldham and Hackman, 1981). *Walt* was already a professor when he acquired his disability, which

perhaps elevated his disability management. The level of inclusion he felt is closely related to the respect and value of his contribution. Whereas, an academic like *Lawrence* who was disabled from the beginning of his employment at 3UCS, found it difficult to establish the status of an international academic contribution. Therefore, disabled academics regardless of status should be equally supported at work, to develop or maintain academic employment in ways that are appropriate to their disability (Roulstone et al., 2004).

10.14 Theme 6 – Disability Policies and Practices

This section focuses on comparing the views of the HR manager and the experiences of disabled academics regarding policies and practices at 3UCS.

Bamboos was very optimistic about the disability equality related policies, confidently stating:

> Our policies are dictated by law (EqA), concerning equal opportunities for all its employees, everybody is treated equally.

These views are consistent with the documentary analysis at 3UCS, following a liberal approach towards equality. He further added that:

> Disabled academics also give suggestions on the University policies, they are not obligated to do so but if they want to, they can, we listen to the complaints and suggestions, trying our best to make changes and apply them.

According to *Bamboos*, the policies regarding disabled employees are consistent with disability equality. However, to explore the validity of the statement above it is compared to the experiences narrated by the disabled academic participants in their OHs.

Bamboos indicated that participation of disabled academics is valued at 3UCS, *Lawrence* wants to be involved in policy-making activities to improve disability acces*s,* but his narrative represents disappointment:

> I was involved in writing part of the statutory of the University, however, it never went forward to become part of the University policy. And the University states that it's inclusive, however in practice they refuse to accept any act of policy-making or amendments.

Lawrence has experienced a variety of obstacles during his activism to improve access for disabled academics (Beresford et al., 1996) but his experiences of bringing a change to 3UCS have not served him well (Morris, 2001). Further, *Lawrence* narrates a disturbing experience with HR:

> The director of HR who said to me, I should work at home, which was not in my job description, so I responded back with references from legal text, winning this issue. But I was moved outside the political circle, the manager went crazy and side-lined me. This was discriminatory, resulting in aggression and victimisation, thus, I was excluded.

Lawrence's treatment made him feel completely unprotected from discrimination and victimisation. In comparison to *Bamboos* interview statements above, *Lawrence* argues that the policies at 3UCS are like an 'empty shell' (Hoque and Noon, 2004: 484). It seems that the University equality policies are more likely to be active when it fears legal consequences. Describing another incident *Lawrence* said:

> During a departmental meeting on policy I told my manager about an incident where I felt bullied regarding lip-reading. I was told by him 'we aren't bullying it's just strong management'. The policies are designed in such a way, that no one could raise an issue! Currently, power belongs to the higher level of people: politicians and bureaucracies, no inclusion, not even asking disabled employees' feedback. The University policies need simple principles and not have binding contracts tying with the law, rather it should tie with the department!

Lawrence views demonstrate the manipulation of policies and practises by the hegemonic structures designed to protect the workplace, rather than the vulnerable (Oldham and Hackman, 1981). The data highlight limited provision for disabled academics, poor management of facilities and lack of consideration of disabled employee's access requirements disturbs the hegemonic veil of equality. Consequently, *Lawrence* was expected to remain silent and oppressed by management at 3UCS, whose normative assumptions focus on the traditional common-sense that gives rise to ableism (Campbell, 2009).

Although, there is an anti-bullying policy at 3UCS, the disabled academics felt that political bureaucracy had made the policies too complicated, creating confusion. Therefore, policies should be simplified so it could be understood and implemented effectively (Cheng et al., 2002). According to *Bamboos*, 3UCS gives significant attention to equal opportunities, directing the policies in accordance with the EqA. Still, it seems that those who chose to become involved feel excluded from participation in policy construction related to disability (Silverman, 2004, Deem and Morley, 2006).

Similarly, *Mandy* felt that the University demonstrated sympathy within their policies and practises only when threatened with legal action, which she explains as follows:

> My University has made a wellbeing-committee to look after all disabled employees. I feel having this service will enhance employees' wellbeing, creating an inclusive place to care for employees. I think is a recommendation for other systems within the University.

However, *Mandy* felt that this was a concession following *Mandy's* harsh experience of being discriminated because of her disability, implying that the University learned through *Mandy's* legal threat.

Suzie experienced a variety of obstacles when accessing policies, information and services during her PhD, which further intensified a tension between disability (un)awareness and the University policies for disabled PhD academics. There is a lot of pressure for English universities to complete PhDs within 4 years (Deem and Brehony, 2000). Therefore, it is absolutely crucial for disabled PhD academics to be a part of the decision to ensure disability accessibility (Tregaskis, 2004, Morris, 2008). She explains:

> I was six months behind. Taking this into account, I had to think about my end-date and I said to myself I need a contingency plan.

Suzie prepared a document for her funding body explaining her condition and how it impacted her PhD along with relevant supporting medical documents. Fortunately, her documents were accepted by the funding body and she was provided with equipment to aid her with her studies. However, she was still pressurized to complete her PhD within 4 years, which seems to be an unreasonable requirement of funding bodies. According to section 149 of the EqA, public organizations are responsible for eliminating discrimination, harassment, and victimisation based on a protected-characteristics (EHRC, 2011a), which could have applied to the reasonable extension of a completion deadline. *Suzie* highlights, a lack of understanding in the application of policies towards disability, resulting into limitations of reasonable adjustments for making provision for disabled people (Deegan, 2000, Barnes and Mercer, 2005).

Walt, on the other-hand, enjoys the quick, appropriate and effective implementation of policies at 3UCS in accommodating his disability, confirming with *Bamboos* declaration about accommodating and implementing disability accessibility. Perhaps, because of his academic seniority-level and his numerous academic contributions at 3UCS. He explains as follows:

> As soon as I informed them about my disability, they provided me with an accessible computer in my lab.

All the participants suggested that disability experiences are necessary in contributing advice within 3UCS practises and policies in creating accessibility and inclusivity (Barton, 1993). Perhaps, because limiting or denying the involvement of disabled academics is limiting the potential for the development of more inclusivity and accessibility (Silverman, 2004, Deem and Morley, 2006). However, sometimes disabled employees find involvement to be problematic, complex and equivocal, preferring to show resistance and feel that they are expected to be less-involved (Bantz, 1989). For example, in the case of *Lawrence* always being shunned when he stood-up against unfair discrimination and suggestions to improve policies. He experienced exclusion when trying to become involved in activities related to disability equality (Deem et al., 2005).

10.15 Theme 7 - Training on Disability awareness

According to *Bamboos* awareness training is essential for creating E&D at the University:

> A range of training opportunities and initiatives are available to ensure that the University is made aware of equalities law and good practice in relation to E&D. But we cannot compel people to do this as it is not part of their job description. Sometimes people do not have time, but there is online training for E&D. If people want to sit in a committee, they need to have passed this online-training. A lot of people didn't like this.

Bamboos's statement suggests that the initiative of awareness training is very much focussed on the law and compliance. According to the EqA, such training is not a mandatory factor (EHRC, 2015), perhaps that is the reason it is not considered to be of high priority for employees. Furthermore, on-line training is just a minimalist approach (Noon, 2018) to disability awareness, as one can complete it without ever interacting with disabled people. These critical factors shall be further investigated through the disabled academic participants' OH, below.

Lawrence gave a more critical appraisal, expressing his disappointment that online training towards disability awareness is available and provided at 3UCS, but just for the sake of the image building and to fulfil a legislative demand (Hoque and Noon, 1999). *Lawrence* felt that this approach does not in any way justify training to improve disability awareness, which makes him and other disabled employees feel frustrated, helpless, depressed and isolated (Fichten and Amsel, 1986). *Lawrence* says bluntly:

> They are too arrogant, they don't care!

Lawrence's negative response is completely understandable (Green et al., 2005) and he added that:

> Disability awareness training should be provided by someone who experiences disability themselves.

Lawrence went on to re-iterate that being normal and abnormal is constructed on the basis of the medical model at 3UCS. Attitudes and behaviour towards disability can change through appropriate disability awareness training (French, 1992). However, actual awareness takes place when there is physical interaction and experiences are shared with non-disabled people by disabled people themselves (Oliver, 1996b, Peterson and Quarstein, 2001), which is crucially missing in on-line training.

Mandy, was passionate about creating disability awareness at 3UCS. She explains as follows:

> An open dialogue is a positive act. I believe awareness and educating will lead to people willing to help, because the more I talk about this the more people will talk about it and thus it becomes less of a taboo.

Disability discrimination is a result of social, environmental and attitudinal barriers (Finkelstein, 1991). *Mandy* felt that disability should be made visible and disability experiences should be shared at 3UCS, to encourage non-disabled people to include and aid, instead of forming negative attitudes towards disabled people. Disability awareness training places discrimination and prejudice in a social-context, moving away from treating disabled people as victims and able-bodied people as oppressors (French, 1992).

Whereas, *Suzie* gave a suggestion about another kind of training for non-disabled, reflecting her experiences as a disabled academic:

> I wonder if managers can be provided training for the equipment provided to us. So, they know how we operate and manage ourselves with academic work.

She suggested that there should be training provided to the academic institutions like funding body managers and disability services about the assistive equipment provided to disabled academics. This should be done so that decision-makers understand disability and its impact, even after the provision of reasonable adjustments, particularly how disabled academics manage their assisted time effectively and efficiently for research, publications and teaching (Goode, 2007). This can only come into existence once the importance of disability awareness i.e. access requirements are recognized, addressed and appropriately registered and understood by non-disabled colleagues and managers (Shevlin et al., 2004).

According to the participants, disability awareness training should involve actual physical interaction, as it is integral for creating equality as an essential part of employment. However, training was not considered mandatory at 3UCS, maintaining a hegemonic ideology that needs to be broken by disseminating organic good-sense training to help in eradicating disability stigma and stereotyping (Salih and Al-Kandari, 2007) discussed in the section below.

10.16 Theme 8 - Stigmatizing and Stereotyping

This section examines disabled academic participants' experiences of being stigmatized and stereotyped at the University, particularly since the policies at 3UCS claim to ensure disability equality advancement.

Firstly, *Bamboos* was asked about dealing with stigma and stereotyping towards disability and management of discrimination, harassment and victimisation at 3UCS. He re-iterated that it is the ultimate aim and objective of 3UCS to eradicate disability stigmatization and stereotyping, creating a healthy workplace. He explained that this is done through regular training and regular assessments of policies and practises and disability campaigning events. There is also the dignity@work policy that applies to all employees, supporting and sustaining a positive working environment free from unacceptable behaviour, like bullying and discrimination. *Bamboos* reiterated this from a compliance perspective saying that 3UCS ensures equality progression and good relations among employees sharing different protected-characteristic. He also added that the 3UCS is also obligated to meet legislation, informed by the EqA.

Lawrence's experience was contrary to *Bamboo's* understanding. His treatment by 3UCS's management made him feel devalued (Major and O'Brien, 2005). *Lawrence* explained that, unfortunately disabled people are still subjected to culturally negative stereotypes and interactions with others, giving rise to stereotypic characteristics and undesirable traits (Stone et al., 1992). He explains as follows:

> Disabled autistic people are good with technical skills. The University blocks promotion on the lack of social grounds because we are disabled, they treat us like peasants!

Furthermore, *Lawrence* suggested that stigma and stereotyping of disability, embedded in the fabric of the institution, needs to be challenged and confronted at the highest levels (Siperstein et al., 2010). He explains:

> So, from where disability discrimination begins, should be tackled from the grass root level, the higher level where the power belongs, who inflicts discrimination.

Lawrence, was anxious about his disability at first, but never allowed himself to be saddened or oppressed by the underestimation of his colleagues. He chose to teach and research in subjects, in which he felt undervalued and undermined by his colleagues and managers:

> I am a mathematician and statistician, I have been doing various tasks relating to supporting high performance and scientific computing, including parallelism and computing languages, teaching engineering software.

Mandy also feels disadvantaged, because of lack of expectations and the stigma and stereotype created towards disability (Schneider, 2005). In her words:

> Because of my disability the University underestimated my potential and thought I won't be able to complete my PhD.

Although initially *Mandy* was considered incapable to complete her PhD, she was determined to complete it even though her disability was unpredictable. She explains:

> After a lot of fighting, paper work and challenging issues I got to continue working on my PhD. I have to complete it no matter what!

As mentioned above, *Suzie* also felt stigmatized by the academic funding body gatekeepers due to her disability during her PhD. *Suzie* was well aware of the stereotyping and stigma towards disabled employees working in academia. Nevertheless, her own experience became a source of inspiration and she chose this as her profession:

> After facing barriers in my PhD, I became interested in researching this subject because of my disability. This helped me understand the experience of having a disability, which means I am able to create good research.

It seems that *Walt* was never really bothered about the stigmatizing and stereotyping of disability. He explains as follows:

> I am disabled, my publications are accelerating and my research is flourishing. My disability never stopped me.

Initially, most of the disabled academic participants faced stigmatization and stereotyping towards their disability, because stereotypes cause narrowed and distorted relationships and are used as an opportunity for distancing and invalidating disabled people (Gilligan and Brown, 1992). However, none of the participants lacked confidence in themselves. Instead, challenging stigma and stereotyping of disability further motivated and encouraged them to become successful academics,

although not directly describing themselves as being emancipated and liberated (Whittington-Walsh, 2002), their language encapsulates success and a sense of winning out. In a Gramscian sense they are displaying organic-intellectualism, challenging traditional hegemonic ideologies by producing critical counter-hegemonic ideologies. They reflect the historical and political positioning of disability in a way that mirrors their experience, consequently converting common-sense into good-sense (Gramsci, 1971a).

10.17 Conclusion

This Chapter has incorporated an in-depth analysis of 3UCS. Firstly, the policies regarding the treatment of disabled academic employees are analysed, which appear to be based on equality. However, they follow the EqA, suggesting a compliance focused, liberal approach towards equality. Next, the employment background of four disabled academic participants are provided in the form of short academic work history outlines. Followed by a comparison of the interview comments of the HR manager and the four disabled academic participants' OH, which are used to examine and capture academic experiences of disability realities, cross-analysing and comparing the socio-political behaviours of the academic able-bodied environments within 3UCS.

It seems that at 3UCS, there is a much closer traditional understanding of disability and a very large gap between the organic understandings of disability. For example, in the case of *Lawrence* 3UCS only extends to the compliance of having hearing-loops installed and not ensuring their maintenance. These findings suggest that the appropriate implementation of reasonable adjustments towards disability should be recognized, in order to reduce in-accessibilities (Adams, 2010) for disabled academic employees at 3UCS.

In conclusion, the social reality of disabled academic employees, unfortunately, depicts a traditional hegemonic ideology towards disability, making it difficult to incorporate a counter-hegemony that can transform common-sense into good-sense. The dominant hegemonic ideology leans towards the medical model (Brisenden, 1986b) blocking possibilities for change (Bryman and Bell, 2007, Mayo, 2014, Hoque, 2014) at 3UCS, thus, establishing a predominance-of-consent (Gramsci, 1971a) at 3UCS. The next Chapter turns to discussing the outcomes of the analysis and potential recommendations for the three University case-studies.

11.0 Chapter Eleven: Discussions on the barriers and enablers to the employment of disabled academics and the theoretical frameworks adopted to understand disability

11.1 Introduction

This Chapter draws upon the author's auto-ethnography and the three University case-study analyses, providing an understanding of the key social and political issues regarding eradication of barriers experienced by disabled academics. The aim is to address the main research question:

> *What are the barriers and enablers to the employment of disabled academics and what theoretical frameworks can be adopted to understand them?*

Using a Gramscian framework (Chapter Four) to highlight insights of disabled academics' employment, i.e. organic-intellectualism, the chapter brings together the research data to construct a counter-hegemony of disability, identifying disability marginalization within the management of disabled academics and the influence of ableism within the workplace. Furthermore, the models of disability along with liberal and radical equality approaches are used in understanding and investigating the management of disabled academics into and during their academic employment. The aim is to identify the construction and maintenance of disability hegemony, connected to deeper conceptualizations of invisibility and discrimination.

The analysis includes the historical, social, cultural and political environments that have influenced employment (Hall, 1997) and have contributed to the creation of disability hegemonies within academia. Disabled academics are not passive and the analysis therefore examines how organic intellectualism leads to the construction of counter-hegemonies by disabled academics, including the author. In other words, this chapter demonstrates knowledge constitution through discussions, 'which requires a study of the social context and social relations within which power and knowledge occur and are distributed' (Carabine, 2001: 275).

In the second University case-study (Chapter Nine) disability was perceived as good-sense, close to normal and less problematic. By comparison, incidents reported in the auto-ethnography (Chapter Seven) and first and third University case-studies (Chapters Eight and Ten) highlighted that disability was perceived as common-sense; different, away from normal. This created problematic circumstances for the disabled academics in their employment, making a negative impact on their employment progression, further highlighting that having a disability contributes towards occupying a marginal space within employment (Thompson et al., 2014). From a Gramscian perspective, the differences between the three case-studies suggest that disability hegemonies are not stable or inevitable in the employment of disabled people and are created within the workplace.

In this study, the distinctions between disability hegemonies are constructed and maintained through good-sense and/or common-sense, which is achieved through interactions and relationships within the workplace (Sherif, 2017). Negative disability hegemonies are created when workplace practices are designed by and for the able-bodied, privileging ableism (Shakespeare, 1994b, Campbell, 2009, Goodley, 2016), reflecting, normalising and recognizing acceptable forms of non-disability within the workplace. Furthermore, articulating the hegemony is achieved by construction, reproduction and maintenance of ableism, through the University workplace practices. The chapter concludes with a review of the contributions and a summary of the practical implications and applications considered in this thesis.

11.2 The common-sense and good-sense approach to disability

The common-sense and negative social and political understandings of disability within this thesis, refocuses disability as being inherently problematic when embodied in the medical model, causing marginalization. Whereas, good-sense, having progressive social and political understanding, relocates disability and re-directs the 'problem' towards ableist society being the barrier (the social model), facilitating the emancipation of disabled people (Barnes and Mercer, 2001). This is because, marginalization or emancipation of disability is created 'through the dominant group's direction of the production and consumption of cultural activities' (Barnes and Mercer, 2001: 516). In short, when dominant populations agree on following a particular idea, so a hegemonic ideology is produced and rests on whether the common-sense or good-sense approach is applied towards disability (Oliver, 1984).

However, the research data indicates that some universities used the social model as a showpiece within the policy on disability without applying it in practice. The motivating factor seemed to be compliance and gaining protection for their university, rather than their disabled academic employees, creating an 'empty shell' (Hoque and Noon, 2004). Therefore, it is argued in this thesis that the social model as well as the medical model can be based on common-sense, manifested by traditional-intellectualism. Organic-intellectuals of disability and their advocates, reject models based on hegemony in light of their everyday experiences of disability. Instead, they advance a new form of good-sense, a counter-hegemony, advocating a true social model where social barriers are removed rather than simply acknowledged. Initially, the concept and theories of the social model were only recognized among disabled people. However, as the social model became driven by legal compliance, it gradually received social and political consent in the wider society and informed social practices and political policies, but often in diluted and instrumental forms. Therefore, the contribution of this thesis demonstrates that the superficial application of the social model, based on just legal obedience, is not sufficient as this does not amend the underlying disability hegemony but instead masks this hegemony. It is argued that the legalistic compliance of applying the social

model maybe of some benefit, but cannot be recognized as a counter-hegemony and an outcome of a war-of-position. Therefore, as argued in Chapter Four, to achieve emancipated positive social and political understandings of disability (Goodley and Lawthom, 2005) a counter-hegemony must be successfully accomplished and the war-of-position won (Mayo, 2014).

11.3 Using documents to build hegemony: documentary analysis at the three University case-studies

The purpose of this section is to identify how hegemonies and counter-hegemonies are created and sustained by documents and policies, depending on the absence or presence in understanding of disability equality, which can either have or lack appropriate information regarding disability requirements. This has been understood through the application of the medical model and/or the social model, influenced by negative common-sense or positive good-sense social and political understandings of disability as mentioned above. For example, 2UCS already largely recognizes good-sense management of disabled employees, suggesting that transformational processes of change have already been accomplished through policies and by winning the war-of-position (Ramos, 1982).

Although 2UCS complies with the EqA, they deliberately escape elaborate detailing of legal requirements; using an inclusive, simple and straightforward approach (NSW, 2013) they recognise the difficulty for non-experts in understanding detailed and legalistic policies. Furthermore, the policies at 2UCS are focussed towards the rights of its employees. For example, after stating the employment policy on reasonable adjustments, a short statement is added 'Remember, it is your legal right to apply for reasonable adjustments and flexible working hours'. By encouraging the use of reasonable adjustments, the policy resonates with the radical equality approach by moving beyond what is recommended by the EqA.

By comparison documentary analysis at 1UCS and 3UCS found that, although the policies ostensibly follow a social model, they are heavily influenced by legislative compliance (EqA). The focus was on protecting the University from any litigation instead of protecting the rights of their disabled academics. Thus, their policy documents are extremely detailed, creating unnecessary bureaucratic barriers and administrative procedures for employees (Adler, 1999), consequently making policies less accessible (Maynard and Maynard, 2000). This analysis was supported in the author's auto-ethnography when dealing with the academic gatekeepers' understanding towards the legislative policy towards disability, like the SFE and the members of the PhD progression examination as well as the Ethics Committee. All of which seemed to be inspired by the medical model approach and reflecting a traditional-intellectual mind-set, which created an unnecessary tension and constraint towards the author's disability, rather than the disabling work environment.

Although, not as developed as 2UCS, there were differences between the other two case-study Universities. 1UCS is attempting to instigate the proactive management of disabled employees. For example, disabled academics are offered assistance like, easy provision of technical IT equipment and flexible working hours for all its disabled employees. This suggests that even a compliance based social model is a step towards the initiation of a counter-hegemony (Cox and Schilthuis, 2012) by bringing about some positive change through policies for a diverse number of employees (Roulstone et al., 2004). Therefore, it is argued that 1UCS is trying to embrace a hegemony based on good-sense by having positive social and political understanding of disability.

Whereas, the cleverly designed incorporation of legislation within the 3UCS's policies, for example the policies relating to the collection of equality data, is used to justify compliance, but which does not translate into equality based improvements (Arthur et al., 2013). This is because such a process of gathering equality data without putting it to use demonstrates a superficial and mechanical approach, unable to benefit the disabled academics at the University.

It seems that, 3UCS has adopted and 1UCS has partially accepted a liberal approach to equality, suggesting that both the Universities observe a system where justice is envisioned as fairness and equal rights are the same for every employee (Wenar, 2013). Whereas, 2UCS has accepted a more radical approach to equality, where structural inequalities and disadvantages are identified to fill in the equality gaps (Jewson and Mason, 1986) within the University's workplace.

Numerous examples in the author's auto-ethnography and most of the disabled academic participants OH data highlight the lack of effectiveness of policies, procedures and practises when the hegemony is constructed from common-sense that is the furthest away from the disabled organic-intellectual's experiences. This leads to a lack of good-sense or understanding of the ways in which disabled academics work, reflecting a negative social and political understanding towards disability that results in exclusive practices. This position is maintained by the predominance-of-consent, accepting the traditional ideology, thus creating a disabling hegemony based on common-sense (Ramos, 1982). The next section turns to explaining how disabled academics become traditional or organic-intellectuals.

11.4 Disabled Academics as Traditional or Organic-Intellectuals

The use of an auto-ethnography within this thesis, demonstrates an organic-intellectual's writing style with an appropriate research design and an analytical orientation, which justifies the author's experiences and expression. Her auto-ethnography identifies that she has been actively occupied in using her organic-intellect based on good-sense in her University politics with the SU and also during her PhD fieldwork. Therefore, by employing an auto-ethnography, the author has satisfied and

justified the purpose of her research (Eriksson, 2013) and presented herself as a disabled organic-intellectual.

However, in certain circumstances some disabled academics prefer to be traditional-intellectuals. *Walt* was identified as a traditional-intellectual amongst the disabled research participants. He was satisfied with his treatment as an academic employee because, as a well-established and internationally well-recognized senior academic, he received and enjoyed privileges provided by his University. *Walt's* example created a strong business case (Gambardella et al., 2015). This, highlights that having a disability does not automatically result in disadvantage or make a person an organic-intellectual.

In comparison, disabled academics who have vulnerable positions in their academic employment may be more likely to develop organic-intellectualism. For example, *Lawrence* and *Nisha* who were both senior disabled academics but because of their activism, were considered to be complainers and objectors at their Universities and both experienced poor practices, even though they are mature and senior. Their experiences demonstrate a paradox that maturity and seniority levels are not a determining factor towards fitting in to the dominant hegemonic ideology of a workplace (Padilla, 2007) if they are not perceived to be contributing to profit-seeking and maximizing the financial well-being (Carroll and Shabana, 2010) of their University.

Similar situations are also observed for junior disabled academics who have just started their academic employment, as they have the vulnerability of being at the beginning of their careers, often with insecure academic employment, which may result in a more hesitant development of organic-intellectualism. For example, *Joseph* and *Suzie* being early career academics, were cautious about asking for too many adjustments towards their disability. Although, both of their past experiences depict that they have been strong organic-intellectuals of disability, now they are hesitant to fully express their disability requirements to their Universities. Being in the initial stages of their academic career placed them in a particularly vulnerable position, making them feel insecure about their University jobs. Torn between disability activism and protecting their academic employment, they were trapped in a constrained relationship towards the workplace management (Donaghey et al., 2011). Consequently, they added to the predominance-of-consent without realizing that perhaps this may lead to traditional-intellectualism and continuation of a dominant disabling hegemony for disabled academics and other employees.

Furthermore, there were also situations when the disabled academics presented their organic-intellectualism, but were muted by the workplace, and preferred to observe silence. The logic here is that it is not worth the effort speaking about workplace problems because their voice will be disregarded and not taken into account and perhaps even dangerous, resulting in punishment for

speaking up (Morrison and Milliken, 2000). For example, *Sydnie's* silence are effects of her past disability experiences during her student life, resulting in fear to ask for further adjustments. Instead, she preferred to remain silent, regardless of her organic-intellectual capabilities within her employment, creating limited workplace expectations (Morgan, 2017).

There are also circumstances when the organic-intellectual is not directly connected to challenging the hegemony. For example, *Catharine* and *Ann* only partially fit the mould of an organic-intellectual as they are not involved in their Universities disability politics. This is because both of them have a disability, an academic career and they also have to care for a family, suggesting that they are unable to participate, due to their family responsibilities (Brody et al., 1987). However, their organic-intellectualism is channelled through their teaching rather than through their political participation. Therefore, they use their good-sense based organic-intellect to open the minds of their students.

Organic-intellectuals who attempt political change in the workplace are often thwarted by a traditional and common-sense understanding of disability. For example, *Lawrence* tried making a change within his University by using his organic-intellect and submitting a policy draft for approval to the policy committee. Unfortunately, his submission was not accepted, as he was told that giving policy recommendations is not allowed by the legislation, demonstrating a mistaken belief (Geffen, 2013). Similarly, organic-intellect by *Nisha* was not understood when dealing with her (temporary) manager and in the auto-ethnography when the author was trying to reason with the SFE about her international and national academic travel for conferences and fieldwork. These examples indicate the dominance of the common-sense understanding of legislation and policies dealing with disability, inspired by the medical model approach and reflecting a traditional-intellectual mind-set.

11.6 Unveiling the Hegemony

This research demonstrates that the type of hegemony that exists in a university depends largely on whether common-sense or good-sense towards disabled academics prevails. An academic career usually begins with a PhD and doing a PhD is a crucial step towards becoming an academic researcher (Åkerlind, 2008, Sinclair et al., 2014). From the author's auto-ethnography alone, it can be seen that in every process regarding the author's PhD research, including the ethics approval, teaching, fieldwork, academic travel and research, a hegemony based on common-sense understandings of disability was experienced. The author's experience was supported by *Mandy* one of the participants from the University case-studies who felt like an outsider as she was treated differently because she was doing a PhD, which resulted in refusal of providing appropriate reasonable adjustments towards her disability, like extra time towards completing her PhD research. However, she was adamant to break through this common-sense grounded hegemonic ideology at her University. Ultimately, she was successful in breaking through the hegemony, by using the

legislation as an aid to bring a counter-hegemony and perhaps win at least a battle in a war-of-position (Baldacchino, 1990). *Nisha* and *Lawrence* also used the EqA when defending themselves from their Universities' common-sense based hegemony. These finding demonstrate that, because the EqA contains elements of the medical model and elements of the social model it can be used either reactively or proactively and a narrow application of the legislation may be used to support a traditional hegemony for disabled employees (Tyrer, 2012, Geffen, 2013). Therefore, the law might be both a negative or positive tool depending on how it is used, either to defend the institution or protect disabled employees.

Adopting such a hegemony means supporting ableism and privileging negative understandings towards disability, which is not considered beneficial towards the progression of disabled academics. For example, *Nisha* had to attend a regular monthly academic meeting. Although, the University management was well aware of her disability they would regularly provide inappropriate facilities, like inaccessible reading materials. Such negligence and misconduct, harms *Nisha* significantly as she wastes time and strength, which could be used towards other essential academic tasks, like marking and teaching. Similarly, *Lawrence's* frustration at being unable to gain appropriate disability requirements was interpreted as antisocial, unacceptable and outside the normal behaviour, rather than something that could be acknowledged as a legitimate response towards discrimination. These decisions reinforced the perception of common-sense understanding of disability as being an individual problem and not the workplace's concern, suggesting that disabled academics' employment depends on the mercy of hegemonic good-sense practises (Foster, 2007, Foster and Wass, 2013).

Furthermore, having a hegemony based on common-sense does not only create disability discrimination towards disabled people at their workplace, but is also an issue within society. For example, *Ann* and *Peter* both experienced discriminatory situations but outside their University, during different stages of their personal life. These experiences of being discriminated left adverse effects on their outlook, which made them feel vulnerable and confused about self-confidence (Arvey, 1979).

The inappropriate use of attitudes, behaviour and language towards disability is also a problematic issue facilitating a traditional hegemony. Common-sense practises that are influenced by negative social and political understandings of disability observe a pre-existing acceptance (French and Swain, 2000) of disability discrimination. For example, *Lawrence* was often referred to as being a 'hassle' and *Nisha* was called 'blind' by her (temporary) manager. As recorded in the auto-ethnography the author experienced similar issues during her fieldwork when gathering participants for her PhD research. Each of these examples demonstrate a traditional hegemonic ideology influenced by a

historical and common-sense approach. They result in an inappropriate positioning towards disability requirements (Swain et al., 2003) and the construction of assumptions that non-disability is a normal expectation, thus, reflecting ableism (Shakespeare, 1994a, Swain et al., 2014). Therefore, hostile attitudes and practices towards disability embody a failure to understand disability from a social model perspective (Foster and Scott, 2015).

Developing a counter-hegemony means replacing common-sense based traditional hegemony by a good-sense based organic hegemony. At 2UCS all the disabled academic participants enjoyed inclusive work practices. For example, *Sydnie* was provided with assistance when travelling long distances, like attending conferences. *Ann* enjoyed the incentives she was provided, like provision of a parking permit at her University and *Peter* was provided with an escort-service to accompany him to his lectures. The hegemony at the University was influenced by the disabled organic-intellectuals, who have managed to collectively convince, produce and maintain good-sense in relation to disability (Mayo, 2014) resulting in a commitment by 2UCS to improving the lives of their disabled academics and reflecting positive good-sense understanding towards disability. Therefore, at 2UCS the war-of-position already seems to have been won. The challenge is now the maintenance of these practises.

The analysis so far argues that a hegemony constructed using common-sense and traditional ideologies gives rise to disability discrimination, which surfaces more readily for marginalized employees, who have the least power (Thompson, 2016) amplifying difficulty for people experiencing their disability effects. However, a positive understanding of disability developed through constructive engagement, leading to change in perceptions towards disability, assists in changing the disagreements into agreements and contradictions into consistencies in accordance to organic-intellectualism of the disabled academics (French et al., 1998) and a hegemony based on good-sense.

11.7 Reasonable adjustments and the implementation of good-sense

This section focusses on the implementation of good-sense, which is partly interpreted as the necessity of accepting appropriate and legitimate reasonable adjustments and providing necessary disability requirements for disabled academics. This is because providing reasonable adjustments helps in the increased employment and productivity of disabled academics, giving rise to new and different ways of thinking and including inclusivity in the workplace (Goodley, 2017). Reasonable adjustments are difficult to deal with by the workplace management when disability is perceived as different and the experiences and requirements of disabled workers are negated and cannot be established as normative expectations (Davis, 1995).

As noted above, the experience of marginalization within their workplace (Barnes, 2010), results in silence as a form of acceptance (predominance-of-consent) or resistance (organic-intellectualism). For example, *Joseph* and *Suzie* were content with the amount of reasonable adjustments provided by their University workplaces, but their workplace academic life would be much smoother if they felt able to ask for further adjustments. Silence as a response therefore assists in discouraging employees from openly and directly expressing their dissatisfaction (Peirce et al., 1998). Fear of challenging the status quo (Detert and Burris, 2007) and/or fear of receiving negative feedback that may affect their employment security and progression (Morrison and Milliken, 2000) is a form of control, which restricts or limits the ability of disabled academics to bring about change at the workplace (Mawdsley and Lewis, 2017).

Requests for reasonable adjustments puncture the predominance-of-consent and may be resisted by managers if accommodation requests are unwelcome and considered unobtainable (Williams and Mavin, 2012) or there is a desire to keep such issues out of the management of the workplace (Foster, 2007, Foster and Scott, 2015). Most of the disabled academic participants have challenged this common-sense resistance to disability requirements and used their knowledge to bring in social change (Abberley, 1987, Oliver, 1996b, Rioux et al., 2015). For example, *Lawrence*, *Nisha* and *Mandy* drew upon the negative social and political common-sense understandings of disability when they identified a disability related gap within their workplace practises. In doing so they argued for appropriate reasonable adjustments needing to be recognised and implemented (Foster, 2007) and for the legitimation of disability as normality through practices and procedures (Oliver and Zarb, 1989, Hughes and Paterson, 1997, French, 2001, Hughes, 2007, Campbell, 2009, Goodley, 2016, Oliver, 2017). In doing so, they demonstrated resistance to the common-sense understandings of disability and brought about social change by countering the hegemony of their workplace management (Ybema et al., 2016) at their University. Similar impact was also noted in the auto-ethnography, when the author, during her fieldwork, bought about change in the way policies were depicted on the website of one of the University case-studies.

However, winning a battle does not win the war and disabled academics should be informed about the lack of maintenance in the provision of reasonable adjustments, because often when appropriate adjustment are initially agreed to, their maintenance can be refused (Watson et al., 1998: 4). In such circumstances the disabled academic should be pre-prepared about experiencing the common-sense that results in such barriers and hindrance within their academic employment.

In order to challenge such ableism at the workplace some counter-resistance approaches were demonstrated by disabled academic participants, suggesting a form of contestation towards exclusion. These contradicted approaches, are critiques of disabled academics to destabilize

normative standards premised upon ableism (Morris, 1993a, Shakespeare, 1994a, Campbell, 2009, Goodley, 2017). Harnessing the proactive elements of the legislation noted above can prove useful. For example, *Nisha* described her experience with her (temporary) manager, leading to an argument which exposed his/her unawareness about the legislation. By demonstrating the (temporary) manager's ignorance of the legislation and policies towards disability, *Nisha* obligated her University to take measurers towards providing reasonable adjustments.

The law is frequently misunderstood by managers, particularly where requests for reasonable adjustments are considered unreasonable because the perception is that the EqA always applies equally to disabled and non-disabled, (Tyrer, 2012, Geffen, 2013). An example was when *Mandy's* request for extra-time to complete her PhD research was rejected and perceived as an unreasonable request. Identifying a lack of awareness, understanding and engagement with the EqA, illustrates an emphasis upon the common-sense understanding of disability (Foster, 2007, Thompson, 2016) and a liberal rights approach towards equality and justice (Woodhams and Corby, 2007, Harwood, 2014) being used. Where this is done, it is usually to protect the employer from litigation, regardless of the effects of further excluding and marginalising the disabled employees' requirements.

Misunderstanding reasonable adjustments within legislation often results from the liberal view that disabled people should not receive special-treatment (Lawson, 2008) when precisely the opposite is the case. For example, Section 149 (4) of the EqA states: "The steps involved in meeting the needs of disabled persons that are different from the needs of persons who are not disabled include, in particular, steps to take account of disabled persons' disabilities." The phrase 'more favourably' in compliance with the duties in this section necessarily means implementation of appropriate reasonable adjustments to equally participate with non-disabled employees (Kirkham et al., 2016). Misinterpretations of the EqA leave common-sense in the workplace unchallenged. Therefore, good-sense would mean the EqA should be understood appropriately as it contributes towards establishing disability as a normative standard, challenging gaps of non-disability (Geffen, 2013).

Ableism contributes towards resisting the legitimacy of disabled academics' requirements, particularly when not accepting reasonable adjustments within management practises (Overboe, 1999, Foster and Fosh, 2010). Therefore, it is essential that good-sense about disability is acknowledged in the workplace by accommodating disability requirements as the good-sense based hegemonic ideology (Hall, 2002b). For example, at 2UCS all the disabled academic participants were genuinely happy with the implementation of reasonable adjustments at their University. This is because the workplace practises positioned disability inside of normative assumptions and is able to conform to the normality notion (Foster, 2007, Woodhams and Corby, 2007, Foster and Scott, 2015). This also means accepting that the positive participation of disabled academics is crucial in moving

away from traditional ideologies of common-sense and the medical model, towards organic ideologies of good-sense and a social model of disability that is more than just policy window-dressing to ensure that the academic workplace really is inclusive and appropriate for disabled academics (Fairhurst and Putnam, 2014, Williams and Mavin, 2015).

Therefore, progressive employment and management of disabled academics in any university is possible, as long as difference is acknowledged and inclusion demonstrated in appropriate policies, practises and procedures that implement effective workplace alterations/accommodations.

Nonetheless, to acquire equitable employment outcomes in universities, an organic ideology needs to be adopted and good-sense hegemony provided by organic-intellectuals needs to be implemented. In conclusion, 'building-upon trust and respect and participation and reciprocity' (Oliver, 1992: 107) is crucial for enhancing disabled academics' employment.

12.0 Chapter Twelve: Conclusion

12.1 Introduction

In this Chapter the central theoretical, conceptual and methodological contributions of the thesis are revisited in order to address the main research question:

> *What are the barriers and enablers to the employment of disabled academics and what theoretical frameworks can be adopted to understand them?*

The thesis is positioned in a social constructivist epistemology and a Gramscian theoretical framework to extend and critique disability models. As a research concept, social constructivism fits neatly with a Gramscian theoretical framework, because hegemony is essentially a theory of how dominant social concepts (like the individual medicalised and the social models of disability) are constructed.

The following sections summarise the empirical, methodological and theoretical contributions of the thesis before providing a more detailed discussion of the contribution in relation to the specific research questions.

12.2 Empirical Contribution

The aim of this thesis was to examine the employment barriers of disabled academics in England by using the author's auto-ethnography and the three University case-studies. The data extracted from them provides an original empirical contribution of the lived experiences of disabled academics in English universities. The empirical data contributes not only towards advancing academic research on disability, but highlights the importance of mainstreaming disability in other disciplines, for example, in human resource/organizational management research. Furthermore, although situated in Academia, the empirical contribution can be used more broadly in understanding the way disabled employees are disadvantaged at other workplaces.

12.3 Methodological Contribution

Using a combination of an auto-ethnography, three university case studies and ten oral history interviews with disabled academics, provides the methodological contribution of this thesis. Using an auto-ethnography very powerfully highlights the day-to-day micro aggressions experienced by disabled academics. Auto-ethnography is rarely used in academic research but in this thesis the author's personal experiences as a researcher discussed in Chapter Seven, guided, supports and compliments the data extracted from the three University case-studies and the oral histories of other disabled academics. Using an oral history interviewing technique within the three University case-studies provided an appropriate method of acquiring sensitive knowledge about barriers and difficulties of the disabled academic participants, in order to investigate and construct their

oppression and activism evidenced in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten. Hence, the methodological contribution within this thesis can be considered an essential tool for facilitating emancipatory research, which is not just an academic contribution; but is also crucial towards the development of policies and practises relating to disability.

12.4 Theoretical Contribution

The theoretical contribution within this thesis is the development and implementation of the Gramscian theoretical framework. This assists in explaining how the social and individual medicalised models of disability augment the understanding of management and experiences of disabled academics employees within their University workplace. For example, using a Gramscian theoretical framework is essential to understanding how the social model has become hegemonic at the workplace without it necessarily helping disabled employees. This was clearly detected at 3UCS, especially in *Lawrence's* comment when discussing his experience about the broken hearing loops in the lecture theatre. Furthermore, using this framework demonstrates how disabled academics become organic-intellectuals, challenging the dominant traditional-hegemony when it fails to help the disabled academics/people/employees at their workplace. Such a Gramscian theoretical framework is once again not only beneficial for academic research, it can also help policymakers to understand how a social model can be implemented without a commitment to real change and without meeting the spirit of the models or proactive legislation.

To draw together the empirical, methodological and theoretical contributions summarised above along with the historical data captured in Chapter Two and contemporary empirical investigation of the three University case-studies, the following sections reflect upon each of the six research sub-questions below:

1. Why and how does the history of attitudes towards disability influence employment of disabled academics?
2. How is disability hegemonized within equality policies and practices in academia?
3. Is emancipatory research part of being an organic-intellectual?
4. How do the models of disability influence the policies and practises of universities for disabled academics' employment?
5. Are disabled academics organic-intellectuals? If so, how is this manifested?
6. How do some parts of the legislation, create the individual medicalised model as hegemony, whereas, other parts encourage disabled organic-intellectuals to challenge the hegemony?

12.5 Why and how does the history of attitudes towards disability influence employment of disabled academics?

As detailed in Chapter Two, historically, disability was considered to be a direct consequence of an individual's bodily impairment, conceptualised in the individual medicalised model of disability (Finkelstein, 1980, Oliver and Zarb, 1989, Oliver, 1996a, Campbell and Oliver, 1996, Barnes, 1997a, Barnes and Mercer, 1997a, Barnes, 2014a). Such an understanding of disability developed because it was advocated by medical experts and social researchers who used traditional, positivist methodologies for researching disability. Such experts had neither the experiential knowledge of disability, nor had they consulted disabled people when conducting their research (Hunt, 1966, Oliver, 1992, Stone and Priestley, 1996, Barnes and Mercer, 1997b, Finkelstein, 2001a). The formulation of the individual medicalised model of disability informed social policies and legislation, making it hegemonic and ultimately oppressing disabled people and disenabling their social inclusion on an equal basis with non-disabled people. The individual medicalised model permeated labour markets where the hegemony was that paid employment is only for the strong, healthy and able-bodied (Rose, 1975), ultimately influencing the exclusion of disabled people.

Even now such a traditional-intellectual's understanding of disability persists, as detected in the analysis of 1UCS and 3UCS in Chapters Eight and Ten, especially, when the disabled academics attempted inclusion at their workplace was met by overt and veiled resistance. Therefore, history has embedded a tenacious belief-system that creates negative attitudes towards disabled people's employment that persists in their exclusion.

12.6 How is disability hegemonized within equality policies and practices in academia?

Within this thesis when disability is viewed through a Gramscian theoretical lens, historically the individual medicalised model became the hegemony because of the views of traditional-intellectuals, such as the medical professions and non-disabled researchers. Acceptance of these views by both disabled and non-disabled people indicate that it became the accepted common-sense by a wider community than just the traditional-intellectuals. Thus, forming a predominance-of-consent in which the majority of society are governed under the hegemonic medicalized disability understanding (Strinati, 2004). This happens when common-sense guides actions uncritically accepted by the majority of the population, maintaining social, economic and material relations of inequality between disabled and non-disabled people. Therefore, hegemony prevails even for those who are oppressed and consent to live their lives according to it, as detailed in Chapter Four.

The empirical research data highlights that hegemonization of disability depends on how disability is perceived at the workplace. If the traditional and common-sense understanding is perceived as liberal equality, creating a level playing-field for both disabled and non-disabled employees and

reactive legal compliance will be the norm. In such cases disability is perceived as having equality in the workplace, but discrimination for the disabled employees may still persist, as noted in examples from 1UCS and 3UCS. However, when a good-sense based positive understanding of disability is perceived, adopting radical equality approaches, the workplace is more progressive and its disabled employees more likely to experience emancipation. According to the empirical analysis, 2UCS is a good example of adopting a proactive approach to disability.

12.7 Is emancipatory research part of being a disabled organic-intellectual?

The research data indicated that emancipatory research is part of being a disabled organic-intellectual, bringing gradual social changes. Researchers can bring about change during the process of their research. For example, one of the immediate social changes accomplished by the author at 1UCS regarding the presentation of equality data, described in the auto-ethnography in Chapter Seven. Conducting disability research requires scrutiny of the author as a disabled academic and evaluation of self and other disabled academics. As demonstrated in the auto-ethnography, issues faced by the researcher are also those faced by the researched. Furthermore, using OH interviewing can be considered a tool of emancipatory research methodology, as it provides a careful and sensitive facilitation of the disabled academic participants to investigate and construct their own oppression and activism evidenced in Chapters Seven, Eight, Nine and Ten.

Therefore, emancipatory disability research certainly achieves personal and social change for the researcher, participating disabled people and others who may benefit from their research and activism. This thesis demonstrates that disabled academics are doing all kinds of research that improve things for disabled academics and students in their universities.

12.8 Appraising the social model of disability within a Capitalist context

As mentioned in Chapter Four, the social model of disability, which is part of the theoretical framework in this thesis, has been used to explain and locate disabled people's disadvantages within capitalist economies. Universities are increasingly expected to work within competitive market-based capitalism and, under these conditions, the data presented in this thesis demonstrate how the social model become incorporated into university policies in ways that make both the model and the policies ineffective. Using a Gramscian theoretical framework, it is argued that disabled academics need to develop an organic hegemonic culture based on effective organic-intellectualism, consisting of good-sense to reclaim an authentic social model of disability and counter the capitalistic traditional-intellectuals' ideology still essentially underpinned by an individualised medical model as natural or normal cultural values within the University. How this was evidenced within the thesis are discussed in more detail in the following sections.

12.9 How do the models of disability influence the policies and practises of universities for disabled academics' employment?

The influence of the disability models on the policies and practise of universities was determined by the documentary analysis in the three university case studies. All three of the Universities acknowledged the social model and as public authorities are expected to deliver the socially desirable goal of improving employment opportunities for disabled academics (ECU, 2012). However, a close analysis of the policies and practises in some of the Universities highlighted that the social model was being used to mask their non-inclusive practises towards disability. Therefore, whilst the discourse in policy documents echo the social model, their practice was thoroughly influenced and adheres to the traditional individual medicalised model. Both senior and junior academics experienced poor practice relating to their disability and vulnerability, either because of early career status or non-permanent employment status magnified the effects of their disability discrimination. However, poor treatment was not universal or inevitable. For example, only academics seen as valuable to the university, such as *Walt* who benefited from the 3UCS disability policies, however the disabled academic participants at 2UCS did not experience unequal practises or policies.

12.10 Are disabled academics organic-intellectuals? If so, how is this manifested?

As noted above, in Gramscian terms, common-sense and traditional disability intellectualism, assisted in the development of the medical model. Organic-intellectuals are those that, because their experiences stand in contradiction, challenge the traditional knowledge that forms the dominant hegemony. The hegemony of the individual medicalised model was recognized as contradictory in the 1960s by the DPM, the organic-intellectuals of that time, who wanted to remove the dependency it established. Resisting the dominant traditional disability hegemony meant developing new forms of organic understanding. As detailed in Chapter Two, in 1983 Mike Oliver, a disabled academic from the DPM, developed the social model of disability (Oliver et al., 2012) that resituated disability as a social problem (Stark, 2009). Moving to a social model meant gaining opportunities towards economic independence through employment. In academia it meant that disabled academics should be able to take control of disability research (Barnes and Mercer, 1997b) and disability research findings used for disabled people's emancipation and enhancing their employment prospects (Finkelstein, 2001b). Furthermore, it helps in countering traditional-intellectual concepts of research methodologies, which assumes researchers are not disabled and need not take account of the implications of disability research.

The research in this thesis argues that the social model may now have become part of the hegemony but organic-intellectualism continues to challenge this. For example, at 2UCS, with input from

disabled academics, the employment policies are based on organic good-sense. At 1UCS policies are in the process of being influenced by disabled organic-intellectualism. By comparison, policies at 3UCS claims social model good-sense. However, OH research data indicate the disability practice indirectly prefers to follow the dominant traditional-intellectual's individual medicalised model, but it also should be remembered that organic-intellectualism may not always manifest because of having a disability. For example, *Catherine* and *Ann*, who are further described in the three University case-studies analysis Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten.

12.11 How do some parts of the legislation, create the medical model as hegemony, whereas, other parts encourage disabled organic-intellectuals to challenge the hegemony?

Historically, disability legislation was based on an individual medicalised model, identifying and separating disabled people in society, for example, disabled children were excluded from attending state schools (RSBC, 2013). Previously, the DDA legislation was perceived to be an important step in achieving civil-rights for disabled people (Barnes, 1992a, Hurst, 2004) and currently, the EqA claims to incorporate the social model of disability, removing disabling barriers and focussing on altering the social environment, to strengthen protection against disability discrimination (Lockwood et al., 2012, Barnes, 2013b), providing rights and advancing equality opportunity (ECU, 2011a). However, the DDA and EqA in certain aspects are argued to reflect the individual medicalised model (Geffen, 2013), causing a restrictive statutory definition of disability and the reactive application of reasonable adjustments allowing employers to provide reasonable adjustments only after the disability is officially recognized by the employing authorities (Chapter One and Four). The concept of reasonableness itself embodies the idea that adjustments should not inconvenience employers and that, in some circumstances, it is 'reasonable' not to make accommodations. Thus, the employer is only required to react to an individual situation and do the minimum to avoid the barrier, not necessarily remove it (Roulstone, 2003, Woodhams and Corby, 2003, Geffen, 2013, Foster and Scott, 2015, William, 2016), consequently creating a hegemonic individual medicalised model perspective. For example, two of the University case-studies, i.e. 1UCS and 3UCS used legalism and compliance to avoid proactive measures and good-sense policies. In other words, they managed to interpret the EqA in ways that were not beneficial towards the disabled academic participants, hence perpetuating hegemony having a common-sense based ideological attitude towards the social model of disability. However, the EqA in some ways also reflects the social model of disability, encouraging disabled organic-intellectuals to challenge this hegemony. Such examples are detected during the analysis of *Nisha*, *Mandy* and *Lawrence*, at 1UCS and 3UCS.

The section will now consider the limitations beyond the theoretical scope of this PhD thesis.

12.12 Research Limitations

During the process of the data collection and analysis, a few limitations were observed. The research suffered from the usual limitations of case study and qualitative research, in that it is not possible to generalise from the findings and it would be difficult to replicate the research. In addition to these, disability research contains some unique limitations. The most anticipated limitation of the study was obtaining sufficient interviewees and the impact it had on the analysis and conclusion. There are still very few disabled academics from which to gain a reasonable sample. Furthermore, disability is an emotive topic and as expected, some of the responses were political. For example, when interviewing the University HR participants, they seemed to be experts in demonstrating their University as accommodating the best policies and workplace practises. Also, some of the responses from early career disabled academic participants were muted, avoiding discussing situations where they were disadvantaged. This is not unusual, because when a person belonging to a minority-group enters employment, they may be hesitant in being open about their workplace experiences, as they fear lack of support or encountering further barriers within the workplace environment (Rudestam and Newton, 2014).

Additionally, there were the usual limitations regarding time and resources available to conduct follow-up interviews and search archives for additional data, but as the auto-ethnography shows, these are magnified for disabled researchers, especially when travel is costly and logistically complicated. Furthermore, the author's disability, made it difficult and challenging to enquire about disabled academic's employment from the non-disabled HR managers. This was because, for largely instrumental reasons, a sympathetic and favourable approach was taken. However, being disabled was also advantageous since the issues that face disabled academics are fully understood by the author and it was also a comforting experience for them when explaining their issues. Instead of being just a detached observer of human behaviour, the author had also similar experiences as the participants, thus, having greater understanding and insight (Smith, 1987).

Another crucial limitation was that the focus on disability in general, rather than focusing on a specific disability-type and investigating only academics, a single employment opportunity within academia. This was because of the author's own personal interest in the issues being explored in this research, which assisted in better understanding and empathising with disabled academics in all of their diversity.

12.13 Future Research

Prospects of future research can be on dividing disability into categories, example wheelchair-users, visual and hearing-impairment, mental-health. Although this would lead to even smaller sample sizes, it would be beneficial to find out the kind of disabled academics who are particularly

disadvantaged in academic employment, proposing a solution. Perhaps in future researching a larger case-study sample could be considered in order to obtain greater access.

The author would like to take forward the Gramscian framework used in this thesis to analyse disabled people's employment in other occupations. For example, in the Political field, disabled organic-intellectual politicians could profoundly change perspectives towards disability, but there are still few disabled organic politicians. It would therefore be interesting to know what specific issues there are for disabled organic politicians. Additionally, the methodological approach of OH has always previously been used in the context of history, however, within this thesis it was used in discovering disabled academics current lived employment experiences. It would be also interesting to use this methodological approach in investigating disabled academic's employment in other sectors of academia.

ABBERLEY, P. 1987. The Concept of Oppression and the Development of a Social Theory of Disability. *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 2**,** 5-19.

ABBERLEY, P. 1992. Counting us out: a discussion of the OPCS disability surveys. *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 7**,** 139-155.

ABBOTT, P., SAPSFORD, R. & MOLLOY, L. 2005. Statistics for equal opportunities in higher education. *Final Report to HEFCE, SHEFC, HEFCW, Glasgow Caledonian Centre for Equality and Diversity*.

ACKER, J. 1990. Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: a theory of gendered organizations. *Gender & Society,* 4**,** 139-58.

ACKER, J. 2006. Inequality regimes: gender, class, and race in organizations'. *Gender & Society,* 20**,** 441-64.

ADAMS, S. 2010. Disabled people want to work more, ONS study finds. *The Telegraph*.

ADDIS, M. E. & MAHALIK, J. R. 2003. Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American psychologist,* 58**,** 5.

ADLER, N. J. & AYCAN, Z. 2018. Cross-Cultural Interaction: What We Know and What We Need to Know. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior,* 5.

ADLER, P. S. 1999. Building better bureaucracies. *The Academy of Management Executive,* 13**,** 36-47.

AHMED, N. 2013. Paralympics 2012 legacy: accessible housing and disability equality or inequality? *Disability & Society,* 28**,** 129-133.

AHMED, N. 2014. Inaccessibility in a disabled friendly world. *Equality and Diversity at LSE* [Online]. Available from: http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/diversity/2014/06/inaccessibility-in-a-disabled-friendly-world/ 2014].

AHMED, S. 2007a. The language of diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 30**,** 235-256.

AHMED, S. 2007b. 'You end up doing the document rather than doing the doing': Diversity, race equality and the politics of documentation. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 30**,** 590-609.

ÅKERLIND, G. S. 2008. An academic perspective on research and being a researcher: an integration of the literature. *Studies in Higher Education,* 33**,** 17-31.
ALBRECHT, G., L., , SEELMAN, K., D., & BURY, M. 2001. *Handbook of disability studies,* London, Sage.
ALBRECHT, G. L. 1992. *The Disability Business: rehabilitation in America,* London, Sage.
ALI, M., SCHUR, L. & BLANCK, P. 2011. What types of jobs do people with disabilities want? *Journal of occupational rehabilitation,* 21**,** 199-210.
ALLAIRE, S. H. 2004. What work changes do people with arthritis make to preserve employment, and are such changes effective? *Arthritis Care & Research,* 51**,** 871-873.
ALSHUWAIKHAT, H. M. & ABUBAKAR, I. 2008. An integrated approach to achieving campus sustainability: assessment of the current campus environmental management practices. *Journal of Cleaner Production,* 16**,** 1777-1785.
ALVESSON, M. & SKÖLDBERG, K. 2009. *Reflexive methodology: New vistas for qualitative research*, Sage.
ANDERSON, R. 2010. The 'Idea of a University'today. *History & Policy,* 1**,** 22-26.
ANDERSON, R. & BURY, M. 1988. *Living with chronic illness: The experience of patients and their families*, Unwin Hyman.
ANDREWS, J. 2005. Wheeling uphill? Reflections of practical and methodological difficulties encountered in researching the experiences of disabled volunteers. *Disability and Society,* 20**,** 201-212.
ANJOYEB, S. 2016. *Disability and Reasonable Adjustments,* NHS Brighton and Sussex University Hospital, Equality, Diversity and Human Rights Department.
APLIN, J. C. & HEGARTY, H. 1980. Political Influence: Strategies Employed by Organizations to Impact Legislation in Business and Economic Matters. *Academy of Management Journal,* 23**,** 438-450.
APPELBAUM, S. H., IACONI, G. D. & MATOUSEK, A. 2007. Positive and negative deviant workplace behaviors: causes, impacts, and solutions. *Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society,* 7**,** 586-598.
ARMER, B. 2004. In Search of a Social Model of Disability: Marxism, normality and culture. *Implementing the social model of disability: Theory and research***,** 48-64.
ARMSTRONG, D. 1983. *The Political Anatomy of the Body*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
ARTHUR, S., MITCHELL, M., GRAHAM, J. & BENINGER, K. 2013. Views and experiences of the public sector equality duty (PSED). London: NatCen Social Research.
ARVEY, R. D. 1979. Unfair discrimination in the employment interview: Legal and psychological aspects. *Psychological Bulletin,* 86**,** 736.
ASHTIANY, S. 2011. The Equality Act 2010: Main Concepts. *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law,* 11**,** 29-42.
ATKINSON, P. 1997. Narrative turn in a blind alley? *Qualitative Health Research***,** 325-344.
ATKINSON, P., DELAMONT, S. & HAMMERSLEY, M. 1988. Qualitative research traditions: a British response to Jacob. *Review of Educational Research,* 58**,** 231-50.
BACA, Z., M. & THORNTON, D., B. 1996. Theorizing difference from multiracial feminism. *Feminist Studies,* 22**,** 321-331.
BALDACCHINO, G. 1990. A war of position: ideas on a strategy for worker cooperative development. *Economic and Industrial Democracy,* 11**,** 463-482.
BALDRIDGE, D. C. & KULKARNI, M. 2017. The shaping of sustainable careers post hearing loss: Toward greater understanding of adult onset disability, disability identity, and career transitions. *Human Relations,* 70**,** 1217-1236.
BALDWIN, M. L. & JOHNSON, W. G. 1998. Dispelling the myths about work disability. *New approaches to disability in the workplace***,** 39-62.
BALL, S. J. 1993. What is policy? Texts, trajectories and toolboxes. *The Australian Journal of Education Studies,* 13**,** 10-17.
BANTZ, C. R. 1989. Organizing and the social psychology of organizing. *Communication Studies,* 40**,** 231-240.

BARAK, M. E. M. 2010. *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*, Sage Publications, Incorporated.
BARAK, M. E. M. 2013. *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace,* London, Sage Publications.
BARAK, M. E. M. 2016. *Managing diversity: Toward a globally inclusive workplace*, Sage Publications.
BARDASI, E., JENKINS, S. & RIGG, J. 2000. Disability, work and income: a British perspective. *Institute for Social and Economic Research Working Paper,* 36.
BARMES, L. & ASHTIANY, W. S. 2003. The Diversity Approach to Achieving Equality: Potential and Pitfalls. *Industrial Law Journal,* 32**,** 274-296.
BARNES & OLIVER 1998. Disability: A Sociological Phenomenon Ignored by Sociologists. *In:* SHAKESPEARE, T. (ed.) *Disability Reader: Social Science Perspectives.* London: Continuum.
BARNES, C. 1985. *Discrimination Against Disabled People (Causes, Meaning and Consequences) Or The Sociology of Disability.* University of Leeds.
BARNES, C. 1990. *Cabbage Syndrome: The Social Construction of Dependence*, Lewes, Falmer.
BARNES, C. 1991. *Disabled People in Britain and Discrimination: The case for anti discrimination legislation,* London, Hurst and Co.
BARNES, C. 1992a. *Disability and Employment,* Leeds, Department of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Leeds.
BARNES, C. 1992b. Qualitative research: valid or irrelevant? *Disability, Handicap and Society,* 7**,** 115-124.
BARNES, C. 1992c. Qualitative Research: Valuable or Irrelevant? *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 7**,** 115-124.
BARNES, C. 1996. Disability and the myth of the independent researcher. *Disability & Society,* 11**,** 107-110.
BARNES, C. 1997a. *A Legacy of Oppression: A History of Disability in Western Culture,* Leeds, The Disability Press.
BARNES, C. 1997b. A legacy of oppression: A history of disability in western culture. *Disability studies: Past, present and future***,** 3-24.
BARNES, C. 1998. Review of Wendell, S., The Rejected Body: Feminist Philosophical Reflections on Disability. *Disability and Society,* 13**,** 145-147.
BARNES, C. 1999. Disability studies: new or not-so-new directions. *Disability & Society,* 14**,** 577-580.
BARNES, C. 2002. 'Emancipatory disability research': project or process? *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs,* 2.
BARNES, C. 2003a. Disability studies: what's the point? *Disability studies: theory, policy and practice conference,* Disability Archive UK.
BARNES, C. 2003b. What a difference a decade makes: Reflections on doing 'emancipatory'disability research. *Disability & Society,* 18**,** 3-17.
BARNES, C. 2004. Disability, disability studies and the academy. *In:* SWAIN, J., FRENCH, S., BARNES, C. & THOMAS, C. (eds.) *Disabling barriers: Enabling environments.* London: Sage.
BARNES, C. 2006. Disability, higher education and the inclusive society. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 28**,** 135-145.
BARNES, C. 2007. Disability, higher education and the inclusive society.
BARNES, C. 2012a. Re-thinking Disability, Work and Welfare. *Sociology Compass,* 6**,** 472-484.
BARNES, C. 2012b. The social model of disability: Valuable or irrelevant. *The Routledge handbook of disability studies***,** 12-29.
BARNES, C. 2013a. Disability studies and the academy—past, present and future. *Ars Vivendi Journal,* 4**,** 3-12.
BARNES, C. 2013b. *Equality Legislation* [Online]. Available: http://www2.redbridge.gov.uk/cms/community_and_life_events/equality_and_diversity/equality_legislation.aspx [Accessed 22/11/2013 2013].
BARNES, C. 2014a. A brief history of discrimination and disabled people. *In:* BARNES (ed.) *Disabled People in Britain and Discrimination: A case for anti-discrimination legislation.* Leeds.

BARNES, C. 2014b. An Ethical Agenda in Disability Research: rhetoric or reality? *In:* MERTENS, D. M., GINSBERG P. E. (ed.) *The Handbook of Social Research Ethics.* London: Sage.
BARNES, C. & MERCER, G. 1996. *Exploring the Divide: Illness and Disability,* Leeds, The Disability Press.
BARNES, C. & MERCER, G. 1997a. Breaking the mould? An introduction to doing disability research. *Doing disability research,* 1**,** 1-14.
BARNES, C. & MERCER, G. 1997b. *Doing Disability Research,* University of Leeds, The Disability Press.
BARNES, C. & MERCER, G. 2001. Disability culture. *Handbook of disability studies***,** 515-534.
BARNES, C. & MERCER, G. 2004a. Changing Disability Policies in Britain *In:* BARNES, C. & G, M. (eds.) *Disability Policy and Practice: Applying the Social Model.* Leeds: The Disability Press.
BARNES, C. & MERCER, G. 2004b. Theorising and Researching Disability from a Social Model Perspective. *In:* BARNES, C., MERCER, G. (ed.) *Implementing the Social Model of Disability: Theory and Research.* Leeds: The Disability Press.
BARNES, C. & MERCER, G. 2005. Disability, work, and welfare challenging the social exclusion of disabled people. *Work, Employment & Society,* 19**,** 527-545.
BARNES, C., MERCER, G. & SHAKESPEARE, T. 1999. *Exploring Disability: A Sociological Introduction*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
BARNES, C., MERCER, G., 2010. *Exploring Disability: a sociological introduction [Second Edition],* Cambridge, Polity.
BARNES, C., OLIVER, M. & BARTON, L. 2002. Disability, the academy and the inclusive society. *Disability studies today***,** 250-260.
BARNES, C. & SHELDON, A. 2007. Emancipatory'disability research and special educational needs. *The Sage handbook of special education***,** 233-246.
BARNES, C. & SHELDON, A. 2010. Disability, politics and poverty in a majority world context. *Disability & Society,* 25**,** 771-782.
BARNES, H., THORNTON, P. & CAMPBELL, S. M. 1998. *Disabled People and Employment: a review of research and development work*, Policy Press.
BARRETT, R. 2010. Disadvantaged groups in the labour market. *Economic and Labour Market Review,* 4**,** 18-24.
BARTON, L. 1993. The struggle for citizenship: the case of disabled people. *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 8**,** 235-248.
BARTON, L. 1996. *Disability and Society: Emerging Issues and Insights,* London, Longman.
BARTON, L. 1998. *Developing an emancipatory research agenda: possibilities and dilemmas,* London, Sage.
BARTON, L. & OLIVER, M. 1997. *Disability studies: Past, present and future*, Disability Press Leeds.
BARTON, L., OLIVER, M. & BARNES, C. 2002. *Disability: the importance of sociological analysis,* London, Causeway.
BARUCH, Y. & HALL, D. T. 2004. The academic career: A model for future careers in other sectors? *Journal of Vocational Behavior,* 64**,** 241-262.
BDF. 2013. *Business Disability Forum* [Online]. London. Available: http://businessdisabilityforum.org.uk/about-us [Accessed].
BDF. 2014. *Business Disability Forum: Realising potential Disability Confidence builds better business Employers' Forum on Disability* [Online]. Available: http://www.realising-potential.org/news/learning-disabilities/ [Accessed].
BEAUCHAMP-PRYOR, K. 2007. *A Framework for the Equality and Inclusion of Disabled Students in Higher Eduation.* Swansea University.
BEAUCHAMP-PRYOR, K. 2011. Impairment, cure and identity: 'where do I fit in?'. *Disability & Society,* 26**,** 5-17.
BECHER, T. & TROWLER, P. 2001. *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines,* Buckingham, McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
BEDEIAN, A. G. 2007. Scientific Management and Stakhanovism in the Soviet Union: A Historical Perspective. *International Journal of Social Economics,* 17.

BEFORT, S. F. 2015. Accommodating an Employee's Commute to Work Under the ADA: Reasonable, Preferential, or Both? *Drake Law Review,* 63**,** 15-16.
BEHAR, R. 2014. *The vulnerable observer: Anthropology that breaks your heart,* Boston, Beacon Press.
BELLAMY, R. P. & SCHECTER, D. 1993. *Gramsci and the Italian state*, Manchester University Press.
BERGER, R. 2015. Now I see it, now I don't: researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research,* 15**,** 219-234.
BERLIN, I. 1956. *The Age of Enlightenment*, Mentor, New York.
BHAVNANI, K. 1990. What's power got to do with it? Empowerment and social research. *In:* PARKER, I. & SHOTTER, J. (eds.) *Deconstructing social psychology.* London: Routledge.
BICKENBACH, J. E. 2008. Disability, non-talent and distributive justice. *Arguing about Disability.* Routledge.
BISHOP, M. 2002. Barriers to employment among people with epilepsy: report of a focus group. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation,* 17**,** 281-286.
BLACKFORD, M. 1981. The Merger Process: An Inside Look by Oral History. *Business and Economic History,* 10.
BLAIKIE, N. 1993. *Approaches to Social Enquiry 1st ed,* Cambridge, Polity Press.
BLENNOW, K., HARDY, J. & ZETTERBERG, H. 2012. The Neuropathology and Neurobiology of Traumatic Brain Injury. *Neuron,* 76**,** 886-899.
BOARDMAN, J., GROVE, B., PERKINS, R. & SHEPHERD, G. 2003. Work and employment for people with psychiatric disabilities. *The British Journal of Psychiatry,* 182**,** 467-468.
BOCHNER, A. 2001. Narratives virtues. *Qualitative Inquiry***,** 131-57.
BOEHM, S. A. & DWERTMANN, D. J. G. 2015. Forging a Single-Edged Sword: Facilitating Positive Age and Disability Diversity Effects in the Workplace Through Leadership, Positive Climates, and HR Practices. *Work, Aging and Retirement,* 1**,** 41-63.
BOGDAN, R. & BIKLEN, S., K., 1992. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods,* London, Allwyn and Bacon.
BONACCIO, S., CONNELLY, C. E., GELLATLY, I. R., JETHA, A. & MARTIN GINIS, K. A. 2019. The Participation of People with Disabilities in the Workplace Across the Employment Cycle: Employer Concerns and Research Evidence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*.
BOON, A., URWIN, P. & KARUK, V. 2011. What Difference Does it Make? Facilitative Judicial Mediation of Discrimination Cases in Employment Tribunals. *Industrial Law Journal,* 40**,** 45-81.
BORSAY, A. 2003. *Disability and Social Policy in Britain since 1750: a History of Exclusion,* Basingstoke, Palgrave.
BORSAY, A. 2005. *Disability and Social Policy in Britain Since 1750,* Basingstoke, Palgrave.
BOURDIEU, P. & PASSERON, J.-C. 1977. Reproduction in education, culture and society. London: Sage.
BOYLORN, R. M. 2006. E pluribus unum (out of many, one). *Qualitative Inquiry,* 12**,** 651-680.
BRADDOCK, D. & BACHELDER, L. 1994. The glass ceiling and persons with disabilities.
BRADING, J. & CURTIS, J. 1996. *Disability Discrimination: A Practical Guide to the New Law,* London, Kogan Page Limited.
BRANFIELD, F. 1998. What Are You Doing Here? 'Non-disabled' people and the disability movement: a response to Robert F. Drake. *Disability and Society,* 13**,** 145-155.
BRECHIN, A. 1993. *Sharing. In Shakespeare P., Atkinson D. and French S. (eds) Reflections on Research in Practice*, Open University Press, Buckingham.
BREWER, J. 2000. *Ethnography,* Buckingham, Open University Press.
BRISENDEN, S. 1986a. Independent Living and the Medical Model of Disability. *Disability, Handicap and Society,* 1**,** 173-8.
BRISENDEN, S. 1986b. Independent Living and the Medical Model of Disability. *Disability, Handicap and Society,* 1**,** 173-8.
BRISTOL., U. O. 2011. The Equality Act 2010 – Implications for Student related activity. *In:* TEAM, U. O. B. E. D. (ed.). Bristol: University of Bristol.

BROADFOOT, K. J. & MUNSHI, D. 2007. Diverse Voices and Alternative Rationalities: Imagining Forms of Postcolonial Organizational Communication. *Management Communication Quarterly,* 21**,** 249-267.
BRODWIN, M. 2008. *Rehabilitation in the private sector: Opportunities and challenges,* Austin, TX, PRO-ED.
BRODY, E. M., KLEBAN, M. H., JOHNSEN, P. T., HOFFMAN, C. & SCHOONOVER, C. B. 1987. Work Status and Parent Care: A Comparison of Four Groups of Women1. *The Gerontologist,* 27**,** 201-208.
BROWN, L. & BOARDMAN, F., K., 2010. Accessing the Field: Disability and the Research Process. *Social Science & Medicine*.
BRUEGEL, I. & KEAN, H. 1995. The moment of municipal feminism: gender and class in 1980s local government. *Critical Social Policy,* 15**,** 147-169.
BRUNNER, R. 2007. *Exploring disability disclosure amongst college and university staff in Scotland,* Stirling, Equality Forward.
BRUYÈRE, S. M., ERICKSON, W. A. & VANLOOY, S. 2004. Comparative Study of Workplace Policy and Practices Contributing to Disability Nondiscrimination. *Rehabilitation Psychology,* 49**,** 28-38.
BRYMAN, A. 1988. *Quantity and Quality in Social Research,* London, Unwin Hyman.
BRYMAN, A. 2015. *Social research methods*, Oxford university press.
BRYMAN, A. & BELL, E. 2007. *Business research methods,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
BRYSON, L. 1979. How do we proceed now we know science is not value free. *In:* WREN, G. (ed.) *Focus on Social Responsibility in Science.* New Zealand: School of Sociology, University of New South Wales, Christchurch, The New Zealand Association of Scientists.
BUNDERSON, J. S. & SUTCLIFFE, K. M. 2002. Comparing alternative conceptualizations of functional diversity in management teams: Process and performance effects. *Academy of management journal,* 45**,** 875-893.
BURCHARDT, T. 2000. *Enduring economic exclusion: disabled people, income and work*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation York.
BURCHARDT, T. 2003a. Being and becoming: Social exclusion and the onset of disability. *JRF*.
BURCHARDT, T. 2003b. Being and becoming: Social exclusion and the onset of disability. *Joseph Rowntree Foundation.* London: ESRC Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion London School of Economics.
BURCHARDT, T. 2005. The education and employment of disabled young people: Frustrated ambition. Bristol: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
BURCHARDT, T. & VIZARD, P. 2007. *Definition of equality and framework for measurement: Final Recommendations of the Equalities Review Steering Group on Measurement,* London, Centre for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.
BURKE, K. 1974. *The philosophy of literary form*, Univ of California Press.
BURLEIGH, M. 1994. *Death and Deliverance: Euthanasia in Germany 1900-1945*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
BURNELL, B. A. & SCHNACKENBERG, H. 2015. *The ethics of cultural competence in higher education*, CRC Press.
BURR, V. 2003. *Social constructionism,* Hove, Routledge.
BURRELL, G. 1984. Sex and Organizational Analysis. *Organization Studies,* 5**,** 97-118.
BURY, M. 1991. The sociology of chronic illness: a review of research and prospects. *Sociology of health & illness,* 13**,** 451-468.
BURY, M. 1996. Disability and the myth of the independent researcher: a reply. *Disability & Society,* 11**,** 111-113.
BUTTIGIEG, J. A. 1995. Gramsci on Civil Society. *boundary 2,* 22**,** 1-32.
BUTTIGIEG, J. A. 2005. The contemporary discourse on civil society: A Gramscian critique. *boundary 2,* 32**,** 33-52.
CALDWELL, K., HARRIS, S. P. & RENKO, M. 2016. Social Entrepreneurs with Disabilities: Exploring Motivational and Attitudinal Factors. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies,* 5**,** 211-244.

CAMMETT, J. M. 1967. *Antonio Gramsci and the origins of Italian Communism*, Stanford University Press.
CAMPBELL, E. 2016. Exploring Autoethnography as a Method and Methodology in Legal Education Research. *Asian Journal of Legal Education,* 3**,** 95-105.
CAMPBELL, F. K. 2009. *Contours of ableism*, Palgrave Macmillan Basingstoke.
CAMPBELL, J. & OLIVER, M. 1996. *Disability politics understanding our past, changing our future,* London, Routledge.
CAMPBELL, J. & OLIVER, M. 2013. *Disability politics understanding our past, changing our future,* London, Routledge.
CARABINE, J. 2001. Unmarried motherhood 1830-1990: A genealogical analysis. *Discourse as data: A guide for analysis***,** 267-310.
CARNOY, M. 1986. *The State and Political Theory,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
CARR, W. & KEMMIS, S. 2003. *Becoming critical: education knowledge and action research*, Routledge.
CARROLL, A. B. & SHABANA, K. M. 2010. The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research and practice. *International journal of management reviews,* 12**,** 85-105.
CASCIO, W. 2018. *Managing human resources*, McGraw-Hill Education.
CHAMBERLAYNE, P., BORNAT, J. & WENGRAF, T. 2000. *The Turn to Biographical Methods in Social Science,* London, Routledge.
CHANDRA, S. 2016. *Gramscian Hegemony* [Online]. Available: https://thefablesoup.wordpress.com/2016/09/26/gramscian-hegemony/ [Accessed 06/11/2019 2019].
CHANG, H. 2008. *Autoethnography as method,* CA, Left Coast Press Walnut Creek.
CHARLES, S. 2005. Person first, disability second: disability awareness training in libraries. *Library Review,* 54**,** 453-458.
CHARLES, T., MORRISSEY, 1970. On Oral History Interviewing. *Oral History Reader.* Perks and Thomson: 107-8.
CHARLTON, J. I. 1998. *Nothing About Us Without Us: Disability Oppression and Empowerment,* Berkeley, University of California Press.
CHASE, S. 2005. Narrative inquiry; Multiple lenses, approaches, voices. *In:* DENZIN, N. K., & LINCOLN, Y. S. (ed.) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research.* London: Sage.
CHEMERS, M., CONSTANZO, M. & OSKAMP, S. 1995. *Diversity in organizations: New perspectives for a changing workplace*, Sage Publications, Incorporated.
CHENG, Y. C., NG, K. H. & MOK, M. M. C. 2002. Economic considerations in education policy making: a simplified framework. *International Journal of Educational Management,* 16**,** 18-39.
CHIA, R. 1995. From Modern to Postmodern Organizational Analysis. *Organization Studies,* 16**,** 579-604.
CHODOROW, N. J. 1989. *Feminism and psychoanalytic theory*, Yale University Press.
CICOUREL, A. V. 1964. *Method and measurement in sociology,* Oxford, England, Free Press of Glencoe.
CLAPTON, J. & FITZGERALD, J. 2011. The History of Disability: A History of 'Otherness'. *New Renaissance Magazine: Renaissance Universal.*
CLC. 2003. *Recruiting, retaining, and developing diverse employees* [Online]. Corporate Leadership Council. Available: http://www.corporateleadershipcouncil.com/delivery/NewDelivery.asp?DocId=65690 [Accessed 2011].
CLEGG, S. & BAILEY, J., R. 2008. *International Encyclopedia of Organization Studies*, Sage Publications.
CLEMENTS, L. & READ, J. 2003. *Disabled People and European Human Rights: A review of the implications of the 1998 Human Rights Act for disabled children and adults in the UK*, Policy Press.

COBEN, D. 2005. *Common sense or good sense? Ethnomathematics and the prospects for a Gramscian politics of adults' mathematics education,* London, Goldsmiths College, University of London.
COCKBURN, C. 1991. *In the way of women: Men's resistance to sex equality in organizations*, Cornell University Press.
COFFEY, A. 2014. Analysing documents. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis***,** 367-380.
COGHLAN, D. & BRANNICK, T. 2014. *Doing action research in your own organization,* London, Sage.
COLGAN, F. & LEDWITH, S. 2000. Diversity, Identities and Strategies of Women Trade Union Activists. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 7**,** 242-257.
COLLIER, A. 1994. *Critical Realism: an Introduction to Roy Bhaskar's Philosophy,* London, Verso.
COMINI, G., BARKI, E. & AGUIAR, L. T. D. 2012. A three-pronged approach to social business: a Brazilian multi-case analysis. *Revista de Administração (São Paulo),* 47**,** 385-397.
CONNELLY, F. M. & CLANDININ, D. J. 1990. Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry. *Educational Researcher,* 19**,** 2-14.
COOGAN, T. 2014. The 'hunchback'. *In:* BOLT, D. (ed.) *Changing Social Attitudes Toward Disability: Perspectives from Historical, Cultural, and Educational Studies.* London: Routledge.
COOK, J. A. & FONOW, M. M. 1984. Am I my sister's gatekeeper? Cautionary tales from the academic hierarchy. *Humanity and Society,* 8**,** 442.
COOPER, R. G. & KLEINSCHMIDT, E. J. 1986. An investigation into the new product process: steps, deficiencies, and impact. *Journal of product innovation management,* 3**,** 71-85.
CORKER, M. & FRENCH, S. 1999. Reclaiming discourse in disability studies. *Disability discourse***,** 1-11.
CORKER, M. & SHAKESPEARE, T. 2002. *Disability/postmodernity: Embodying disability theory*, Bloomsbury Publishing.
CORNELIUS, N., GOOCH, L. & TODD, S. 2001. Managing difference fairly: an integrated "partnership" approach. *In:* NOON, M. & OGBONNA, E. (eds.) *Equality, Diversity and Disadvantage in Employment.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
CORRIGAN, P., THOMPSON, V., LAMBERT, D., SANGSTER, Y., NOEL, J. G. & CAMPBELL, J. 2003. Perceptions of discrimination among persons with serious mental illness. *Psychiatric Services,* 54**,** 1105-1110.
COSTA, G., ÅKERSTEDT, T., NACHREINER, F., BALTIERI, F., CARVALHAIS, J., FOLKARD, S., DRESEN, M. F., GADBOIS, C., GARTNER, J. & SUKALO, H. G. 2004. Flexible working hours, health, and well-being in Europe: some considerations from a SALTSA project. *Chronobiology international,* 21**,** 831-844.
COUSER, G. T. 2005. Disability and autoethnography: Riding [and writing] the bus with my sister. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 34**,** 121-142.
COUSSEY, M. & JACKSON, H. 1991. *Making equal opportunities work*, Pitman Publishing.
COX, R. H. & SCHILTHUIS, A. 2012. Hegemony and Counterhegemony. *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization.* John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
COX, R. W. 1983. Gramsci, hegemony and international relations: an essay in method. *Millennium,* 12**,** 162-175.
COX, T. 1993. *Cultural Diversity in Organizations: Theory,* San Francisco.
COX, T. 2001. *Creating the multicultural organization: A strategy for capturing the power of diversity*, Jossey-Bass.
COX, T. H. & BLAKE, S. 1991. Managing Cultural Diversity: Implications for Organizational Competitiveness. *The Executive,* 5**,** 45-56.
CREHAN, K. A. 2002. *Gramsci, culture and anthropology*, Univ of California Press.
CROOK, S. 1998. Minotaurs and other Monsters: Everyday Life in Recent Social Theory. *Sociology,* 32**,** 523 - 540.
CROTTY, M. 1998. *The foundations of social research. Meaning and perspective in the research process,* London, Sage.
CROW, L. 1996. Including all of our lives: Renewing the social model of disability. *Encounters with strangers: Feminism and disability***,** 206-226.

CROWE, S., CRESSWELL, K., ROBERTSON, A., HUBY, G., AVERY, A. & SHEIKH, A. 2011. The case study approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology,* 11**,** 100.
CUNNINGHAM, I., JAMES, P. & DIBBEN, P. 2004. Bridging the Gap between Rhetoric and Reality: Line Managers and the Protection of Job Security for Ill Workers in the Modern Workplace. *British Journal of Management,* 15**,** 273-290.
CZARNIAWSKA, B. 2014. *A theory of organizing*, Edward Elgar Publishing.
DALDAL, A. 2014. Power and ideology in Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci: A comparative analysis. *Review of History and Political Science,* 2**,** 149-167.
DALY, D. A., SIMON, C. A. & BURNETT-STOLNACK, M. 1995. Helping Adolescents Who Stutter Focus on Fluency. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools,* 26**,** 162-168.
DANIELI, A. & WOODHAMS, C. 2005. Emancipatory Research Methodology and Disability: A Critique. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* 8**,** 281-296.
DAVIDSON, L., TONDORA, J., O'CONNELL, M. J., KIRK JR, T., ROCKHOLZ, P. & EVANS, A. C. 2007. Creating a recovery-oriented system of behavioral health care: moving from concept to reality. *Psychiatric rehabilitation journal,* 31**,** 23.
DAVIDSON, M. J. & COOPER, C. L. 1992. *Shattering the glass ceiling: The woman manager*, Paul Chapman Publishing.
DAVIES, C. A. 1999. *Reflexive Ethnography: A Guide to Researching Selves and Others,* London, Routledge.
DAVIS, K. 1990. A Social Barriers Model of Disability: Theory into Practice (the emergence of the 'Seven Needs'). *Derbyshire Coalition of Disabled People*.
DAVIS, L., J. 1995. *Enforcing normalcy: disability, deafness and the body,* London, Verso.
DEEGAN, M. J. 2000. Counting steps: The phenomenology of walking with variable mobility. *Disability Studies Quarterly,* 20**,** 232-42.
DEEGAN, P. E. 1992. The Independent Living Movement and people with psychiatric disabilities: Taking back control over our own lives. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal,* 15**,** 3.
DEEM, R. & BREHONY, K. J. 2000. Doctoral Students' Access to Research Cultures-are some more unequal than others? *Studies in Higher Education,* 25**,** 149-165.
DEEM, R., FULTON, K., REED, M. & WATSON, S. 2001. *New managerialism and the management of UK universities*, Economic and Social Research Council.
DEEM, R. & MORLEY, L. 2006. Diversity in the academy? Staff perceptions of equality policies in six contemporary higher education institutions. *Policy Futures in Education,* 4**,** 185-202.
DEEM, R., MORLEY, L. & TLILI, A. 2005. *Negotiating Equity in HEIs: A case-study analysis of policies and staff experiences* [Online]. Bristol: Higher Education Funding Council for England. Available: https://pure.royalholloway.ac.uk/portal/en/publications/negotiating-equity-in-heis-a-casestudy-analysis-of-policies-and-staff-experiences(ccc9936b-7518-4c86-a313-6f6d354e050b).html [Accessed 25/05/2016 2016].
DEEPAK, S., KUMAR, J., RAMASAMY, P. & GRIFFO, G. 2014. An emancipatory research on CBR and the barriers faced by persons with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation,* 36**,** 1502-1507.
DEJONG, G. 1979. *The movement for independent living: Origins, ideology, and implications for disability research*, University of Michigan, University Center for International Rehabilitation.
DELEUZE, G. 1997. *Essays Critical and Clinical,* Minnesota, MN, University of Minnesota.
DENSCOMBE, M. 2014. *The Good Research Guide: For Small-Scale Social Research,* UK, McGraw-Hill International.
DENZIN, N. 2006. Analytic Autoethnography, or Déjà Vu all Over Again. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 35**,** 419-427.
DENZIN, N. K. 1970. *The research act in sociology*.
DENZIN, N. K. & LINCOLN, Y. S. 2011. *The Sage handbook of qualitative research,* USA, Sage.
DESLIPPE, D. 2012. *Protesting affirmative action: The struggle over equality after the civil rights revolution,* Baltimore, JHU Press.
DETERT, J. R. & BURRIS, E. R. 2007. Leadership behavior and employee voice: Is the door really open? *Academy of management journal,* 50**,** 869-884.

DEWSON, S., RITCHIE, H., MEAGER, N. & BRITAIN, G. 2005. *New deal for disabled people: survey of employers*, CDS.
DICKENS, L. 1999. Beyond the business case: a three-pronged approach to equality action. *Human Resource Management Journal,* 9**,** 9-19.
DILTHEY, W. 2012. *Descriptive psychology and historical understanding*, Springer Science & Business Media.
DIRECTGOV. 2013. *Benefits & credits: Access to Work* [Online]. Available: https://www.gov.uk/access-to-work/overview [Accessed 07/03/2013 2013].
DISABLEDGO. 1999. *Providing Independance and Choice* [Online]. Stevenage: Disabled Enabled Limited. Available: http://www.disabledgo.com/organisations/ [Accessed 29/11/2016 2016].
DITOMASO, N., POST, C. & PARKS-YANCY, R. 2007. Workforce diversity and inequality: Power, status, and numbers. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.,* 33**,** 473-501.
DOBBIN, F. 2009. *Inventing equal opportunity*, Princeton University Press.
DOBUSCH, L. 2017. Diversity discourses and the articulation of discrimination: the case of public organisations. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 43**,** 1644-1661.
DONAGHEY, J., CULLINANE, N., DUNDON, T. & WILKINSON, A. 2011. Reconceptualising employee silence: problems and prognosis. *Work, Employment and Society,* 25**,** 51-67.
DOWDING, K. 2004. Interpretation, truth and investigation: comments on the interpretative political science of Bevir and Rhodes. *British Journal of Politics and International Relations,* 6**,** 136-142.
DOWNEY, S. N., VAN DER WERFF, L., THOMAS, K. M. & PLAUT, V. C. 2015. The role of diversity practices and inclusion in promoting trust and employee engagement. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 45**,** 35-44.
DOYLE, B. 1994. *New Directions Towards Disabled Workers' Rights,* London, Institute of Employment Rights.
DOYLE, B. 1995. *Disability, Discrimination and Equal Opportunities,* London, Mansell.
DRAKE, R. F. 1997. What am I doing here? 'Non-disabled' people and the Disability Movement. *Disability & Society,* 12**,** 643-645.
DSA. 2014. *Disabled Students' Allowance (DSA)* [Online]. Gov.UK. Available: https://www.gov.uk/disabled-students-allowances-dsas/overview [Accessed 17/10/2014 2014].
DU BOIS, B. 1979a. Passionate Scholarship--Notes on Values, Knowing and Method in Feminist Social Science.
DU BOIS, B. 1979b. Passionate Scholarship: Notes on Values, Knowing and Method in Feminist Social Science. *In:* BOWLES, G. & DUELLIKLEIN, R. (eds.) *Theories of Women's Studies.* Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
DUCKETT, P. S. 1998. What are you doing here? 'Non-disabled' people and the disability movement: A response to Fran Branfield. *Disability & Society,* 13**,** 625-628.
DUCKETT, P. S. & PRATT, R. 2001. The Researched Opinions on Research: Visually impaired people and visual impairment research. *Disability & Society,* 16**,** 815-835.
DUFFY, R. D. & DIK, B. J. 2009. Beyond the Self: External Influences in the Career Development Process. *The Career Development Quarterly,* 58**,** 29-43.
DUNN, D. S. & ANDREWS, E. E. 2015. Person-first and identity-first language: Developing psychologists' cultural competence using disability language. *American Psychologist,* 70**,** 255.
DURVASULA, S. & LYSONSKI, S. 2010. Money, money, money–how do attitudes toward money impact vanity and materialism?–the case of young Chinese consumers. *Journal of Consumer Marketing,* 27**,** 169-179.
DUTTON, J. E. & RAGINS, B. R. 2017. *Exploring positive relationships at work: Building a theoretical and research foundation*, Psychology Press.
DWP. 2016. *Family Resources Survey 2015/2016* [Online]. Department of Work and Pension. Available: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/600465/family-resources-survey-2015-16.pdf [Accessed].

DWP. 2017. *Access to Work* [Online]. Department of Work and Pension. Available: http://www.dwp.gov.uk/supplying-dwp/what-we-buy/access-to-work/ [Accessed 2018].
EC 2005. *The business case for diversity: good practices in the workplace,* Luxembourg, Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
EC. 2008. *European Commission, Employment, Social Welfare and Inclusion* [Online]. Available: http://ec.europa.eu/social/home.jsp?langId=en [Accessed 2011].
ECKERSLEY, B., CRANE, L., KINASH, S., BANNATYNE, A., HAMLIN, G., PARTRIDGE, H., RICHARDSON, S., ROLF, H. & UDAS, K. 2016. National research on the postgraduate student experience: Case presentation on postgraduate student diversity (Volume 2 of 3).
ECU 2011a. *Implications for higher education institutions*, Equality Challenge Unit.
ECU. 2011b. *Public sector equality duty: specific duties for England: Implications for higher education institutions* [Online]. Equality Challenge Unit. Available: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/publications/public-sector-equality-duty-specific-duties-for-england#sthash.4quYSzUk.dpuf [Accessed].
ECU 2012. Equality Act 2010: Implications for colleges and HEIs (revised August 2012). Equality Challenge Unit.
ECU. 2015a. *About ECU's Athena SWAN Charter* [Online]. Equality Challenge Unit. Available: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/equality-charters/athena-swan/about-athena-swan/ [Accessed 09/12/16 2016].
ECU. 2015b. *Equality Impact Assessment* [Online]. Equality Challenge Unit. Available: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/guidance-resources/governance-and-policies/equality-impact-assessment/ [Accessed 09/12./2016 2016].
EDELMAN, L. B., FULLER, S. R. & MARA-DITRA, I. 2001. Diversity rhetoric and the managerialization of law. *American Journal of Sociology***,** 1589-1641.
EDGERTON, R. B. & BERCOVICI, S. M. 1976. The cloak of competence: Years later. *American Journal of Mental Deficiency*.
EDWARDS, R. 1990. Connecting Method and Epistemology. *Women's Studies International Forum,* 13**,** 477-490.
EHRC. 2010a. *Employment Statutory Code of Practice* [Online]. Available: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/sites/default/files/employercode.pdf [Accessed 02/08/2013 2013].
EHRC 2010b. Technical Guidance on the Public Sector Equality Duty England. *In:* COMISSION, E. H. R. (ed.). EHRC.
EHRC. 2011a. Hidden in plain sight Inquiry into disability-related harassment. Available: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/inquiries-and-assessments/inquiry-into-disability-related-harassment/hidden-in-plain-sight-the-inquiry-final-report/ [Accessed 15/10/2011].
EHRC 2011b. *Objectives and the equality duty: A guide for public authorities*.
EHRC 2012. *Working Better: The perfect partnership – workplace solutions for disabled people and business,* Manchester, Equality and Human Rights Commission Policy report.
EHRC 2014. Your Rights to Equality at Work: Working Hours, Flexible Working and Time Off Equality Act 2010 Guidance for Employees. Equality and Human Rights Commission.
EHRC. 2015. *What is the Equality Act?* [Online]. London: Equality and Human Rights Commision. Available: http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/legislation/equality-act-2010/what-equality-act [Accessed 26/02/2016 2016].
EHRC. 2017a. *Disability discrimination* [Online]. Equality Human Rights Commision. Available: https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/disability-discrimination [Accessed 06/10/2017 2017].
EHRC. 2017b. *Disability progress 'littered with missed opportunities and failures'* [Online]. London: EHRC. Available: https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/our-work/news/disability-progress-%E2%80%98littered-missed-opportunities-and-failures%E2%80%99 [Accessed 15/08/2018 2018].

ELLEN, N., G., 2009. Research on Disability and Development: Some Thoughts from the North. *In:* LEONARD CHESHIRE CENTRE FOR DISABILITY AND INCLUSIVE DEVELOPMENT, U. C. L. (ed.) *AfriNEAD Conference,*. Cape Town, South Africa.
ELLIS, C., ADAMS, T. E. & BOCHNER, A. P. 2010a. *Autoethnography: An Overview*.
ELLIS, C., ADAMS, T. E. & BOCHNER, A. P. Autoethnography: an overview. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 2010b.
ELLIS, C. S. & BOCHNER, A. 2000. Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject.
ELLIS, C. S. & BOCHNER, A. P. 2006. Analyzing Analytic Autoethnography: An Autopsy. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography,* 35**,** 429-449.
ELMES, M. B., MILLS, A. J., PRASAD, P. & PRASAD, A. 1997. *Managing the organizational melting pot: Dilemmas of workplace diversity*, Sage Publications, Incorporated.
ELY, R. J. & THOMAS, D. A. 2001. Cultural Diversity at Work: The Effects of Diversity Perspectives on Work Group Processes and Outcomes. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 46**,** 229-273.
EQA 2010. *Equality Act 2010,* London, HM Stationery Office.
ERASMUS. 2012. *The United Kingdom's international organisation for cultural relations and educational opportunities* [Online]. UK: British Council. Available: http://www.britishcouncil.org/erasmus.htm [Accessed 2012].
ERICKSON, B. H. 2001. Good networks and good jobs: The value of social capital to employers and employees. *Social capital: Theory and research***,** 127-158.
ERIKSSON, P. 2013. Longitudinal autoethnography. *In:* PAAVILAINEN & RAUKKO (eds.) *Handbook of longitudinal research methods in studies of organizations.* Edvard Elgar.
ETHERINGTON, K. 2004. *Becoming a reflexive researcher: using our selves in research,* London, Jessica Kingsley.
EU 2008/9. Disability Action Plan: Situation of disabled people in the European Union: the European Action Plan 2008-2009. *In:* COMMUNITIES, C. O. T. E. (ed.). Brussels.
EUROPE, I. 2008. The Specific Risks of Discrimination against Persons in Situations of Major Dependence or with Complex Needs. Brussels: Inclusion Europe.
EVANS, J. 2003. *The independent living movement in the UK* [Online]. Available: www.independentliving.org/docs6/evans2003.html [Accessed 14/10/2015].
FAIRHURST, G. T. & PUTNAM, L. L. 2014. Organizational discourse analysis. *The SAGE handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods***,** 271-296.
FARBER, B. 1986. Historical contexts of research on families with mentally retarded members. *In:* GALLAGHER, J. J. & VIETZE, P. M. (eds.) *Families of handicapped persons: Research, programs, and policy issues.* Baltimore: Brookes.
FARMER, M. & MACLEOD, F. 2011. Involving Disabled People in Social Research. *Guidance by the Office for Disability Issues*.
FAUBION, J. D. 1994. Power: Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984. Vol. 3. London: Penguin Books.
FAY, B. 1987. *Critical Social Science: Liberation and its Limits*, Cornell University Press.
FAY, C. H. & THOMPSON, M. A. 2001. Contextual Determinants of Reward Systems' Success: An Exploratory Study. *Human Resource Management,* 40**,** 213-226.
FEAGIN, J. R., ORUM, A. M. & SJOBERG, G. 1991. *A case for the case study*, UNC Press Books.
FELSINGER, A. & BYFORD, K. 2010. Managing reasonable adjustments in higher education. *London: Equality Challenge Unit*.
FEVRE, R., FOSTER, D., JONES, M. & WASS, V. 2016. *Closing Disability Gaps at Work - Deficits in Evidence and Difference in Experience,* Cardiff, Cardiff University.
FEVRE, R., ROBINSON, A., LEWIS, D. & JONES, T. 2013. The ill-treatment of employees with disabilities in British workplaces. *Work, Employment & Society,* 27**,** 288-307.
FICHTEN, C. S. & AMSEL, R. 1986. Trait Attributions About College Students With a Physical Disability: Circumplex Analyses and Methodological Issues1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 16**,** 410-427.

FINCH, J. 1984. Its great to have someone to talk to': the ethics and politics of interviewing women. *In:* BELL, C. R., H. (ed.) *Social Researching: Politics, Problems, Practice.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
FINCH, J. 1988a. Research and Policy: The Uses of Qualitative Methods in Social and Educational Research. *British Journal of Educational Studies,* 36**,** 77-78.
FINCH, J. 1988b. Research and policy: The uses of qualitative methods in social and educational research.
FINCH, J. & GROVES, D. 1983. *A labour of love: Women, work, and caring*, Routledge.
FINKELSTEIN, V. 1980. *Attitudes and disabled people,* Geneva, London, New York, World Rehabilitation Fund, World Health Organization.
FINKELSTEIN, V. 1985. World Health Organization. *Netherlands.*
FINKELSTEIN, V. 1988. To deny or not to deny disability. *Physiotherapy,* 74**,** 650-652.
FINKELSTEIN, V. 1991. Disability: An administrative challenge?(The health and welfare heritage). *Social Work Disabled People and Disabling Environments***,** 19-39.
FINKELSTEIN, V. 1996. Modelling disability. *Disability Studies Program, Leeds University, UK*.
FINKELSTEIN, V. 2001a. *A personal journey into disability politics*, Centre for Disability Studies, Leeds University.
FINKELSTEIN, V. 2001b. *The social model of disability repossessed* University of Leeds, Centre for Disability Studies.
FINKELSTEIN, V. 2001c. *The social model repossessed,* University of Leeds, Centre for Disability Studies.
FINKELSTEIN, V. 2007. *The 'Social Model of Disability' and the Disability Movement*.
FITZGERALD, M. 2000. You look so well: The multiple facets of hidden disabilities. *Society for Disability Studies Quarterly,* 20**,** 2.
FITZGERALD, T. 2012. Documents and documentary analysis. *Research methods in educational leadership and management***,** 296-308.
FLECHA, R. 2014. *Successful educational actions for inclusion and social cohesion in Europe*, Springer.
FLICK, U. 2014. *An introduction to qualitative research*, Sage.
FLYVBJERG, B. 2006. Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative inquiry,* 12**,** 219-245.
FORD, F. A. 1999. *Modeling the environment: an introduction to system dynamics models of environmental systems*, Island Press.
FOSTER, D. 2007. Legal obligation or personal lottery?: Employee experiences of disability and the negotiation of adjustments in the public sector workplace. *Work, Employment & Society,* 21**,** 67-84.
FOSTER, D. & FOSH, P. 2010. Negotiating 'Difference': Representing Disabled Employees in the British Workplace. *British Journal of Industrial Relations,* 48**,** 560-582.
FOSTER, D. & SCOTT, P. 2015. Nobody's responsibility: the precarious position of disabled employees in the UK workplace. *Industrial Relations Journal,* 46**,** 328-343.
FOSTER, D. & WASS, V. 2012. Disability in the Labour Market: An Exploration of Concepts of the Ideal Worker and Organisational Fit that Disadvantage Employees with Impairments. *Sociology*.
FOSTER, D. & WASS, V. 2013. Disability in the Labour Market: An Exploration of Concepts of the Ideal Worker and Organisational Fit that Disadvantage Employees with Impairments. *Sociology,* 47**,** 705-721.
FRASER BUTLIN, S. 2011. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities: does the Equality Act 2010 measure up to UK international commitments? *Industrial Law Journal,* 40**,** 428-438.
FREDMAN, S. 2011. *Discrimination Law,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
FREEDEN, M. 2003. *Ideology: A very short introduction*, Oxford University Press.
FRENCH, S. 1992. Simulation Exercises in Disability Awareness Training: A Critique. *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 7**,** 257-266.

FRENCH, S. 1993. Disability, impairment or something in between? *In:* J. SWAIN, V. FINKELSTEIN, FRENCH, S. & OLIVER, M. (eds.) *Disabling Barriers - Enabling Environments.* SAGE Publications.
FRENCH, S. 1994. *Researching disability, On Equal Terms: Working with disabled people*, Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
FRENCH, S. 2001. *Disabled people and employment: A study of the working lives of visually impaired physiotherapists,* Aldershot, Ashgate Pub Limited.
FRENCH, S. 2017. *Revival: Disabled People and Employment (2001): A Study of the Working Lives of Visually Impaired Physiotherapists*, Routledge.
FRENCH, S., MALINA, D. & MASLIN-PROTHERO, S. 1998. Surviving the institution: working as a visually disabled lecturer in higher education. *In:* MALINA, D. & MASLIN-PROTHERO, S. (eds.) *Surviving the academy: Feminist perspectives.* London: Falmer Press.
FRENCH, S. & SWAIN, J. 2000. Institutional abuse: memories of a 'special'school for visually impaired girls–a personal account. *In:* BORNAT, J., PERKS, R., THOMPSON, P. & WALMSLEY, J. (eds.) *Oral history, health and welfare.* London: Routledge.
FRENCH, S. & SWAIN, J. 2004. Researching together: A participatory approach. *Physiotherapy: A Psychosocial Approach*.
FURNESS, P. J. & GARRUD, P. 2010. Adaptation After Facial Surgery: Using the Diary as a Research Tool. *Qualitative Health Research,* 20**,** 262-272.
GABEL, S. & PETERS, S. 2004. Presage of a paradigm shift? Beyond the social model of disability toward resistance theories of disability. *Disability & Society,* 19**,** 585-600.
GAGE, N. L. 1989. The paradigm wars and their aftermath a "historical" sketch of research on teaching since 1989. *Educational researcher,* 18**,** 4-10.
GALLAGHER, D. J., CONNOR, D. J. & FERRI, B. A. 2014. Beyond the far too incessant schism: special education and the social model of disability. *International Journal of Inclusive Education,* 18**,** 1120-1142.
GALLAGHET, H. G. 1990. *By Trust Betrayed: Patients and Physicians in the Third Reich,* London, Henry Holt.
GAMBARDELLA, A., PANICO, C. & VALENTINI, G. 2015. Strategic incentives to human capital. *Strategic Management Journal,* 36**,** 37-52.
GARLAND-THOMSON, R. 2006. Ways of staring. *Journal of Visual Culture,* 5**,** 173-192.
GARLAND, R. R. J. 1995. *The Eye of the Beholder: Deformity and Disability in the Graeco-Roman World*, Duckworth, London.
GATES, L. B. 2000. Workplace accommodation as a social process. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation,* 10**,** 85-98.
GEBER, B. 1992. Managing diversity. *Training***,** 23-30.
GEFFEN, R. 2013. *The Equality Act and the Social Model of Disability* [Online]. University of Leeds: Centre for Disability Studies. Available: http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/library/titles/T/ [Accessed 07/09/2016 2016].
GERBER, D. A. 1990. Listening to Disabled People: The Problem of Voice and Authority in Robert B. Edgerton's the Cloak of Competence. *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 5**,** 3-23.
GERGEN, K. 1999. *An Invitation to Social Construction,* London, Sage.
GERMON, P. 2010. Purely Academic? Exploring the Relationship Between Theory and Political Activism. *Disability & Society,* 14**,** 687-692.
GERSICK, C. J. 1988. Time and transition in work teams: Toward a new model of group development. *Academy of Management journal,* 31**,** 9-41.
GEWIN, V. 2011. Equality: The fight for access. *Nature,* 469**,** 255–257.
GIDDENS, A. 1976. *New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretative sociology,* London, Hutchinson.
GIGNAC, M. A. M., COTT, C. & BADLEY, E. M. 2000. Adaptation to Chronic Illness and Disability and Its Relationship to Perceptions of Independence and Dependence. *The Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences,* 55**,** P362-P372.
GILBERT, K. 2000. *The emotional nature of qualitative research*, CRC Press.

GILLESPIE-SELLS, K. & CAMPBELL, J. 1991. Disability Equality Training. *London: London*.
GILLIGAN, C. & BROWN, L. M. 1992. *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development*, Harvard University Press.
GIOVANNINI, M. 2004. What gets measured gets done: Achieving results through diversity and inclusion. *Journal for Quality and Participation,* 27**,** 21-27.
GLEESON, B. J. 1997. Disability Studies: A historical materialist view. *Disability & Society,* 12**,** 179-202.
GLUCK, S. 1977. What's so special about women? Women's oral history. *Frontiers: A journal of women studies,* 2**,** 3-17.
GODWIN, K. 2006. Goldman Sachs: investing in change. *Equal Opportunities Review,* 150**,** 12.
GOFFEE, R. & JONES, G. 2007. Leading clever people. *Harvard business review,* 85**,** 72.
GOLDBERG, S. G., KILLEEN, M. B. & O'DAY, B. 2005. The Disclosure Conundrum: How People With Psychiatric Disabilities Navigate Employment. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law,* 11**,** 463.
GOLDSTEIN, S. B. & JOHNSON, V. A. 1997. Stigma by Association: Perceptions of the Dating Partners of College Students With Physical Disabilities. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology,* 19**,** 495-504.
GOODE, J. 2007. 'Managing' disability: early experiences of university students with disabilities. *Disability & Society,* 22**,** 35-48.
GOODLEY, D. 2016. *Disability studies: An interdisciplinary introduction*, Sage.
GOODLEY, D. 2017. Dis/entangling Critical Disability Studies. *In:* WALDSCHMIDT, A., BERRESSEM, H. & INGWERSEN, M. (eds.) *Culture-Theory-Disability: Encounters between Disability Studies and Cultural Studies.* Germany: Transcript.
GOODLEY, D. & LAWTHOM, R. 2005. *Psychology and Disability: Critical Introductions and Reflections,* London, Palgrave.
GORDON, D. & REYNOLDS, R. 2017. Using Civil and Disability Rights History to Encourage Social Equity. *Beyond Bystanders.* Springer.
GOTTFRIED, H. 1998. Beyond Patriarchy: Theorising Gender and Class. *Sociology,* 32**,** 451 - 468.
GOTTLIEB, R. S. 1989. An Anthology of Western Marxism. *An anthology of western Marxism.* New York: Oxford UP.
GOV.UK 2011. Public sector: quick start guide to the specific duties. *In:* OFFICE, G. E. (ed.).
GOV.UK. 2014. *Statutory leave and time off* [Online]. Government Digital Service. Available: https://www.gov.uk/browse/employing-people/time-off [Accessed 17/12/2016 2016].
GOV.UK. 2016. *Recruitment and disabled people* [Online]. Jobcentre Plus. Available: https://www.gov.uk/recruitment-disabled-people/encouraging-applications [Accessed 10/12/2016 2016].
GRAMSCI, A. 1971a. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. *In:* Q. HOARE & G. NOWELL SMITH, E. A. T. (ed.). London, New York: Lawrence and Wishart.
GRAMSCI, A. 1971b. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks,* London, New York, Lawrence and Wishart.
GRAMSCI, A. 1971c. Selections from the Prison Notebooks, edited and translated by Q. Hoare and GN Smith. New York: International Publishers.
GRAMSCI, A. 2007. Prison Notebooks. *In:* BUTTIGIEG, T. J. A. (ed.). Columbia: Columbia University Press.
GRAMSCI, A. 2009. Hegemony, intellectuals and the state. *Cultural theory and popular culture: A reader,* 2**,** 210-16.
GRAY, C. 2009. Narratives of Disability and the Movement from Deficiency to Difference. *Cultural Sociology,* 3**,** 317-332.
GREEN, C. 1993. Advanced Capitalist Hegemony and the Significance of Gramsci's Insights: A Restatement. *Social and Economic Studies,* 42**,** 175-207.
GREEN, S., DAVIS, C., KARSHMER, E., MARSH, P. & STRAIGHT, B. 2005. Living Stigma: The Impact of Labeling, Stereotyping, Separation, Status Loss, and Discrimination in the Lives of Individuals with Disabilities and Their Families. *Sociological Inquiry,* 75**,** 197-215.
GREENWALD, A. G. & BANAJI, M., R. 1995. Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, seli-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychoiogicai Review***,** 4-27.

GREWAL, I., JOY, S., LEWIS, J., SWALES, K. & WOODFIELD, K. 2002. Disabled for life?'attitudes towards, and experiences of, disability in Britain. *Rrsearch Report - Department of Work and Pension*.
GROOM, C., BODENHAUSEN, G. V., GALINSKY, A. D. & HUGENBERG, K. 2003. The Reappropriation of Stigmatizing Labels: Implications for Social Identity. *Identity Issues in Groups.*
GROVE, J. 2016. THE University Workplace Survey 2016: results and analysis. *Times Higher Education: World University Ranking*.
GRUE, J. 2011. Discourse analysis and disability: Some topics and issues. Sage, London.
GUBA, E. & LINCOLN, Y. 1994. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *In:* DENZIN, N. & LINCOLN, Y. (eds.) *Handbook of qualitative research.* London: Sage.
GULLIFORD, J. 2015. *Enabling work: disabled people, employment and the UK economy* [Online]. Scope. Available: https://www.scope.org.uk/Scope/media/Images/Publication%20Directory/Landman_Report.PDF?ext=.pdf [Accessed 03/02/2017 2017].
GUSTAVSSON, A. 2004. The role of theory in disability research-springboard or strait-jacket? *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research,* 6**,** 55-70.
HAFFTER, C. 1968. The Changeling: History and Psychodynamics of Attitudes to Handicapped Children in European Folklore. *Journal of the History of Behavioural Sciences***,** 55-61.
HALL, E. & WILTON, R. 2015. Thinking differently about 'work'and social inclusion for disabled people. *In:* GROVER, C. & PIGGOTT, L. (eds.) *Disabled People, Work and Welfare: Is Employment Really the Answer?* UK: The Policy Press.
HALL, E. J. 1997. Ambiguous Empowerment: The Work Narratives of Women School Superintendents. By Susan E. Chase. University of Massachusetts Press, 1995. 272 pp. $45.00. The University of North Carolina Press.
HALL, H. 2002a. Why it is good to employ people with disabilities. *Spinal Network News,* 5**,** 6-7.
HALL, K. Q. 2002b. Feminism, Disability, and Embodiment. *NWSA Journal,* 14**,** vii-xiii.
HALL, S., HELD, D. & MCGREW, A. G. 1992. *Modernity and its Futures,* Cambridge, Polity Press in association with Blackwell Publishers and the Open University.
HALL, S. & O'SHEA, A. 2013. Common-sense neoliberalism. *Soundings,* 55**,** 9-25.
HANDY, C. 2012. *The age of unreason*, Random House.
HANSEN, F. 2003. Diversity's business case doesn't add up. *WORKFORCE-COSTA MESA-,* 82**,** 28-33.
HARALAMBOS, M. & HOLBORN, M. 2013. *Sociology Themes and Perspectives,* London, Collins.
HARAWAY, D. 1988. Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist studies,* 14**,** 575-599.
HARDING, S. 1987. *Feminism and methodology: Social science issues*, Indiana University Press.
HARDING, S. 1993. Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: What is Strong Objectivity? *In:* L. ALCOFF, E. P. (ed.) *Feminist Epistemologies.* New York/London: Routledge.
HARDING, S. 2004. *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader Intellectual and Political Controversies,* Routledge, New York.
HARLAN, S. L. & ROBERT, P. M. 1998. The Social Construction of Disability in Organizations Why Employers Resist Reasonable Accommodation. *Work and Occupations,* 25**,** 397-435.
HARRIS, A. I., COX, E. & SMITH, C. R. W. 1971. *Handicapped and impaired in Great Britain*, HM Stationery Office.
HARRIS, D. 1992. *From class struggle to the politics of pleasure: The effects of Gramscianism on cultural studies,* London, Taylor & Francis.
HARRIS, S. G. & SUTTON, R. I. 1986. Functions of parting ceremonies in dying organizations. *Academy of Management journal,* 29**,** 5-30.
HARTER, L. M. 2017. Engaging Narrative Theory to Disrupt and Reimagine Organizing Processes. *Management Communication Quarterly,* 31**,** 297-299.
HARTSOCK, N. C. 1983. The feminist standpoint: Developing the ground for a specifically feminist historical materialism. *Discovering reality.* Springer.
HARVEY, D. 2010. *The Enigma of Capital,* London, Profile Books.

HARWOOD, R. 2014. 'The dying of the light': the impact of the spending cuts, and cuts to employment law protections, on disability adjustments in British local authorities. *Disability & Society,* 29**,** 1511-1523.
HATFIELD, R. 2005. Duty to accommodate. *Just Labour,* 5.
HAYNES, K. 2006. Other lives in accounting: critical reflections on oral history methodology in action. York: University of York.
HAYNES, K. 2011. Tensions in (re) presenting the self in reflexive autoethnographical research. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal,* 6**,** 134-149.
HC 2019. Enforcing the Equality Act: the law and the role of the Equality and Human Rights Commission. London: House of Commons Women and Equalities Committee.
HEARN, J. & PARKIN, W. 1995. *Sex at work: the power and paradox of organisation sexuality*, Palgrave Macmillan.
HEARN, J., SHEPPARD, D. L., TANCRED-SHERIFF, P. & BURRELL, G. 1989. *Sexuality of organization*, Sage.
HEPPLE, B. 2010. The New Single Equality Act in Britain. *The Equal Rights Review,* 5**,** 11-22.
HEPPLE, B. 2014. *Equality: The Legal Framework*, Bloomsbury Publishing.
HEPPLE, B., LESTER, A., ELLIS, E., ROSE, D. & SINGH, R. 1997. Improving Equality Law: the Options, Justice and Runnymede Trust. *Indiana International & Comparative Law Review 10 Ind. Int'l & Comp. L. Rev. (1999-2000)*.
HERITAGE, J. & CLAYMAN, S. 2011. *Talk in action: Interactions, identities, and institutions*, John Wiley & Sons.
HERMAN, N. J. & MIALL, C. E. 1990. The positive consequences of stigma: Two case studies in mental and physical disability. *Qualitative Sociology,* 13**,** 251-269.
HERON, J. 1981. Experiential research methodology. *In:* REASON, P. & ROWAN, J. (eds.) *Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research.* New York: Wiley.
HERRING, C. 2009. Does diversity pay?: Race, gender, and the business case for diversity. *American Sociological Review,* 74**,** 208-224.
HERTZ 1997. *Reflexivity and VOICE,* London, Sage.
HESA. 2013. *Free Online Statistics - Staff* [Online]. Cheltenham: Higher Education Statistics Agency. Available: https://www.hesa.ac.uk/stats-staff [Accessed 11/01/2014 2014].
HESA. 2015. *Higher Education Statistics Agency: Data Tables* [Online]. Cheltenham. Available: http://www.hesa.ac.uk [Accessed 12/01/16 2016].
HESA. 2016. *Free Online Statistics - Staff* [Online]. Cheltenham: Higher Education Statistics Agency. Available: https://www.hesa.ac.uk [Accessed 12/04/2016 2016].
HESSE-BIBER, S. N. 2011. *Handbook of feminist research: Theory and praxis*, SAGE publications.
HESSE-BIBER, S. N. & LEAVY, P. 2010. Oral History: collaborative method of (auto) biography interviews. *The practice of qualitative research.* SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
HEYER, K. 2007. A Disability Lens on Sociolegal Research: Reading Rights of Inclusion from a Disability Studies Perspective. *Law & Social Inquiry,* 32**,** 261-293.
HIBBARD, M. R., CANTOR, J., CHARATZ, H., ROSENTHAL, R., ASHMAN, T., GUNDERSEN, N., IRELAND-KNIGHT, L., GORDON, W., AVNER, J. & GARTNER, A. 2002. Peer support in the community: initial findings of a mentoring program for individuals with traumatic brain injury and their families. *The Journal of head trauma rehabilitation,* 17**,** 112-131.
HIMMELFARB, G. 2008. *The roads to modernity: The British, French, and American enlightenments*, Random House.
HINDESS, B. 1977. *Philosophy and Methodology in the Social Sciences*, Harvester Press.
HINKIN, T. R. & TRACEY, J. B. 2010. What makes it so great? An analysis of human resources practices among Fortune's best companies to work for. *Cornell Hospitality Quarterly,* 51**,** 158-170.
HL 2016. The Equality Act 2010: the impact on disabled people. *In:* DISABILITY, S. C. O. T. E. A. A. (ed.). London: Authority of the House of Lords: The Stationery Office Limited.
HOLLER, R. 2017. Disabling Ideas – Disabling Policies: The Case of Disability Employment Policy in the Newly Established Israeli State. *Social Policy & Administration,* 51**,** 424-441.

HOLLOMOTZ, A. 2013. Making life work: freedom and disability in a community group home. *Disability & Society*, 1-3.
HOQUE, K. 2014. *Employers breaking promises to disabled people* [Online]. Warwick: Warwick Business School. Available: http://www.wbs.ac.uk/news/employers-breaking-promises-to-disabled-people/ [Accessed 23/07/2015 2015].
HOQUE, K. & BACON, N. 2014. Unions, joint regulation and workplace equality policy and practice in Britain: evidence from the 2004 Workplace Employment Relations Survey. *Work, Employment and Society,* 28, 265-284.
HOQUE, K. & NOON, M. 1999. Racial Discrimination in Speculative Applications: New Optimism Six Years On? *Human Resource Management Journal,* 9, 71-82.
HOQUE, K. & NOON, M. 2004. Equal Opportunities Policy and Practice in Britain: Evaluating the 'Empty Shell' Hypothesis. *Work, Employment & Society,* 18, 481-506.
HOSKING, D., M., 1999. Social construction as process: some new possibilities for research and development. *Concepts and Transformation,* 4, 117-132.
HOWARD, M. 2003. An "interactionist" perspective on barriers and bridges to work for disabled people. *London: ippr*.
HUGHES, B. 2007. Being disabled: towards a critical social ontology for disability studies. *Disability & Society,* 22, 673-684.
HUGHES, B. & PATERSON, K. 1997. The Social Model of Disability and the Disappearing Body: Towards a sociology of impairment. *Disability & Society,* 12, 325-340.
HUMPHREY, J. C. 1998. Self-organise and Survive: Disabled people in the British trade union movement. *Disability & Society,* 13, 587-602.
HUMPHRIES, B., MERTENS, D. M. AND TRUMAN C., 2000. Arguments for an 'emancipatory' research paradigm. *Research and Inequality, London: UCL Press*, 3 -23.
HUNT, P. 1966. 'A Critical Condition. *Stigma: The Experience of Disability.* London: Geoffrey Chapman.
HURST, R. 2004. Legislation and human rights. *Disabling barriers–Enabling environments*, 297-302.
IMRIE, R. 1996. Ableist Geographies, Disablist Spaces: Towards a Reconstruction of Golledge's 'Geography and the Disabled'. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 21, 397-403.
IMRIE, R. 1997. Rethinking the relationships between disability, rehabilitation, and society. *Disability and Rehabilitation,* 19, 263-271.
INEQUALITY. 2017. I don't think employers see what disabled people can do. *The Guardian*.
IPPR 2003. 1 in 5 adults has a disability - government must do more to get disabled people jobs. Institute of Public Policy Research.
JACKSON, S. E. & JOSHI, A. 2011. Work team diversity. *In:* ZEDECK, S. (ed.) *A handbook of industrial and organizational psychology.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
JACOBS, N. 2010. *Emancipatory Disability Research (or: Why it matters that the 'academy' isn't more accessible for disabled people)* [Online]. Available: http://naomijacobs.wordpress.com/2010/03/26/emancipatory/ [Accessed 12/12/2011 2011].
JAIN, S., GEORGE, G. & MALTARICH, M. 2009. Academics or entrepreneurs? Investigating role identity modification of university scientists involved in commercialization activity. *Research policy,* 38, 922-935.
JAMMAERS, E., ZANONI, P. & HARDONK, S. 2016. Constructing positive identities in ableist workplaces: Disabled employees' discursive practices engaging with the discourse of lower productivity. *Human Relations,* 69, 1365-1386.
JAMROZIK, K. 2004. Research ethics paperwork: what is the plot we seem to have lost? *BMJ: British Medical Journal,* 329, 286.
JANACK, M. 1997. Standpoint epistemology without the "standpoint"?: An examination of epistemic privilege and epistemic authority. *Hypatia,* 12, 125-139.
JANSSENS, M. & ZANONI, P. 2005. Many diversities for many services: Theorizing diversity (management) in service companies. *Human Relations,* 58, 311-340.

JENKINS, S. P. & RIGG, J. A. 2004. Disability and Disadvantage: Selection, Onset, and Duration Effects. *Journal of Social Policy,* 33**,** 479-501.
JESSOP, B. 2007. *State power*, Polity.
JEWSON, N. & MASON, D. 1986. The theory and practice of equal opportunities policies: liberal and radical approaches. *The Sociological Review,* 34**,** 307-334.
JINGREE, T., FINLAY, W. & ANTAKI, C. 2006. Empowering words, disempowering actions: an analysis of interactions between staff members and people with learning disabilities in residents' meetings. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research,* 50**,** 212-226.
JOHANSSON, F. 2013. *Diversity Drives Innovation* [Online]. The Medici Group. Available: http://www.themedicigroup.com/summit [Accessed 07/03/2013 2013].
JOHNSON, R. 2018. From municipal feminism to the Equality Act – Legislation and gender equality work in UK local government 1980-2010. *Women's Studies International Forum,* 66**,** 1-8.
JONES, G. 1986. *Social Hygiene in the Twentieth Century*, Croom Helm, London.
JOSHI, A. & ROH, H. 2009. The Role Of Context In Work Team Diversity Research: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Academy of Management Journal,* 52**,** 599-627.
JOSSELSON, R. 2007. The Ethical Attitude in Narrative Research: Principles and Practicalities. *In:* CLANDININ, D. J. (ed.) *Handbook of narrative inquiry: Mapping a methodology.* Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
KAHN, R. L. & CANNELL, C. F. 1957. The dynamics of interviewing; theory, technique, and cases.
KAMP, A. & HAGEDORN-RASMUSSEN, P. 2004. Diversity Management in a Danish Context: Towards a Multicultural or Segregated Working Life? *Economic and Industrial Democracy,* 25**,** 525-554.
KANDOLA, R. S. & FULLERTON, J. 1994. *Managing the mosaic: Diversity in action*, Institute of Personnel and Development.
KARENILLINGWORTH 2005. The effects of dyslexia on the work of nurses and healthcare assistants. *Nursing Standard,* 19**,** 41-48.
KATZ, E. E. 2014. Social enterprise businesses: A strategy for creating good jobs for people with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation,* 40**,** 137-142.
KELAN, E. 2008. Bound by stereotypes? *Business Strategy Review,* 19**,** 4-7.
KELLY, L., BURTON, S. & REGAN, L. 1994. Researching women's lives or studying women's oppression? Reflections on what constitutes feminist research. *In:* MAYNARD, M., & PURVIS, J. (ed.) *Researching Women's Lives from a Feminist Perspective.* London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
KEVLES, D. J. 1985. *In the Name of Eugenics*, New York.
KIDDER, T. 1982. *The Soul of a New Machine,* New York, Avon.
KIRKHAM, R., WEBSTER, M., CHEN, K.-L. & VINES, J. 2016. Using Disability Law to expand Academic Freedom for Disabled Researchers in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Historical Sociology,* 29**,** 65-91.
KITCHIN, R. 2000a. The Researched Opinions on Research: Disabled people and disability research. *Disability & Society,* 15**,** 25-47.
KITCHIN, R. 2000b. The Researched Opinions on Research: disabled people and disability research. *Disability & Society,* 15**,** 25 -47.
KITCHIN, R. 2002. Towards emancipatory and empowering disability research: Reflections on three participatory action research projects.
KITCHIN, R. O. B. 1998. 'Out of Place', 'Knowing One's Place': Space, power and the exclusion of disabled people. *Disability & Society,* 13**,** 343-356.
KONONENKO, N. 2011. Handbook of Narrative Inquiry: Mapping a Methodology. *Journal of Folklore Research Reviews*.
KONRAD, A. M. & LINNEHAN, F. 1995. Formalized HRM structures: Coordinating equal employment opportunity or concealing organizational practices? *Academy of Management Journal***,** 787-820.

KOYITHARA, T. 2018. Law and Disability: How The UK Is Still Reinforcing The Medical View Of Disability. *OxHRH Blog* [Online]. Available from: http://ohrh.law.ox.ac.uk/law-and-disability-how-the-uk-is-still-reinforcing-the-medical-view-of-disability [Accessed 20/02/2018 2018].
KRISTIANSEN, K. & TRAUSTADÓTTIR, R. 2004. *Gender and disability research in the Nordic countries,* Sweden, Studentlitteratur.
KROOK, M. L. 2016. Contesting gender quotas: dynamics of resistance. *Politics, Groups, and Identities,* 4**,** 268-283.
KVALE, S. 1995. The social construction of validity. *Qualitative inquiry,* 1**,** 19-40.
LACLAU, E. & MOUFFE, C. 2001. *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*, Verso.
LAMOND, I. R. 2017. Book review: Jan Grue, Disability and Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society,* 28**,** 229-231.
LAMONT, M. & MOLNÁR, V. 2002. The study of boundaries in the social sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 28**,** 167-195.
LANG, R. 2007. The development and critique of the social model of disability. *London: Leonard Cheshire Disability and Inclusive Development Centre*.
LATHER, P. 1988. Feminist perspectives on empowering research methodologies. *Women's Studies International Forum,* 11**,** 569-581.
LATHER, P. 2017. *(post) critical Methodologies: The Science Possible After the Critiques: the Selected Works of Patti Lather*, Taylor & Francis.
LAURENB EDELMAN, SALLY RIGGS FULLER & IONA MARA-DRITA 2001. Diversity Rhetoric and the Managerialization of Law. *American Journal of Sociology,* 106**,** 1589-1641.
LAWSON, A. 2008. *Disability and equality law in Britain: the role of reasonable adjustment*, Bloomsbury Publishing.
LAWSON, A. 2011. Disability and Employment in the Equality Act 2010: Opportunities Seized, Lost and Generated. *Industrial Law Journal,* 40**,** 359-383.
LAYDER, D. 1993. *New strategies in social research: An introduction and guide,* Cambridge, Polity Press.
LEACH, B. 1996. Disabled People and the Equal Oppourtunities Movement. *In:* HALES, G. (ed.) *Beyond Disability: towards an enabling society.* London: Sage.
LEHRER, K. 2018. *Theory of knowledge,* New York, Routledge.
LEWIS, S. 2015. Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches. *Health Promotion Practice,* 16**,** 473-475.
LEWIS, T. 2012. Proving Disability and Reasonable Adjustments: A Worker's Guide to Evidence under the Equality Act 2010. London: Central London Law Centre.
LIEBLICH, A., TUVAL-MASHIACH, R. & ZILBER, T. 1998. *Narrative research: Reading, analysis, and interpretation*, Sage.
LIFF, S. 1997. Two routes to managing diversity: individual differences or social group characteristics. *Employee Relations,* 19**,** 11-26.
LIFF, S. & WAJCMAN, J. 1996. 'Sameness' and 'Difference' Revisited: Which Way Forward For Equal Opportunity Initiatives? *Journal of Management Studies,* 33**,** 79-94.
LINDSAY, S. 2011. Discrimination and other barriers to employment for teens and young adults with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation,* 33**,** 1340-1350.
LINK, B. 1982. Mental patient status, work, and income: An examination of the effects of a psychiatric label. *American Sociological Review***,** 202-215.
LINTON, K., MOORE, F. & EXWORTHY, M. 2015. *Perspectives on workforce diversity: a context-based approach to understanding diversity and equality in the police service.* Royal Holloway, University of London.
LINTON, S. 1998. *Claiming disability: knowledge and identity,* New York, New York University Press.
LITVIN, D. R. 2005. Making Space for a Better Cause. *In:* ALISON M KONRAD, PUSHKALA PRASAD & PRINGLE, J. (eds.) *Handbook of workplace diversity.* London: Sage.

LLOYD, M., PRESTON-SHOOT, M., TEMPLE, B. & ROBERT WUU 1996. Whose project is it anyway? Sharing and shaping the research and development agenda. *Disability & Society,* 11**,** 301-316.
LOCKWOOD, G., HENDERSON, C. & THORNICROFT, G. 2012. The Equality Act 2010 and mental health. *The British Journal of Psychiatry,* 200**,** 182-183.
LOFLAND, J. & LOFLAND, H., LYN, 1995. *Analyzing social settings: a guide to qualitative observation and analysis,* Belmont, California, Wadsworth.
LONGMORE, P., K., 2003. *Why I Burned my Book and Other Essays on Disability,* Philadelphia, Temple University Press.
LONGMORE, P. K. 1988. Uncovering the Hidden History of People with Disabilities. *Reviews in American History,* 15**,** 355-64.
LORBER, J. 1994. *Paradoxes of gender*, Yale University Press.
LORDS, H. O. 2016. The Equality Act 2010: the impact on disabled people. *In:* DISABILITY, S. C. O. T. E. A. A. (ed.). London: Authority of the House of Lords: The Stationery Office Limited.
LOWTON, K. 2004. Only when I Cough? Adults' Disclosure of Cystic Fibrosis. *Qualitative Health Research,* 14**,** 167-186.
LUCAS, H. 2008. *Disclosure and support issues for disabled staff in higher education* [Online]. Equality Challenge Unit. Available: http://www.ecu.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/external/disclosure-and-support-issues-for-disabled-staff-in-higher-education-report-2008.pdf [Accessed].
LURY, C. 1995. The rights and wrongs of culture: Issues of theory and methodology. *Feminist cultural theory: Process and production***,** 33-45.
MACARTHUR, J., BROWN, M., MCKECHANIE, A., MACK, S., HAYES, M. & FLETCHER, J. 2015. Making reasonable and achievable adjustments: the contributions of learning disability liaison nurses in 'Getting it right' for people with learning disabilities receiving general hospitals care. *Journal of Advanced Nursing,* 71**,** 1552-1563.
MACKAY, J. 1995. Frequency of occupational injury and illness for employees with developmental disabilities. *Dissertation Abstracts International***,** 294.
MACKINNON, C. A. 1983. Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: Toward Feminist Jurisprudence. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society,* 8**,** 635-658.
MAHOWALD, M. B. 1998. A feminist standpoint. *In:* SILVERS, A., WASSERMAN, D. T. & MAHOWALD, M. B. (eds.) *Disability, Difference, Discrimination: Perspectives on Justice in Bioethics and Public Policy.* USA: Rowman & Littlefield.
MAJOR, B. & O'BRIEN, L. T. 2005. The Social Psychology of Stigma. *Annual Review of Psychology,* 56**,** 393-421.
MALIKA, M. 2011. Equality: The New Legal Framework. *Industrial Law Journal,* 40**,** 466-468.
MALOS, S. 2015. Overt Stereotype Biases and Discrimination in the Workplace: Why Haven't We Fixed This by Now? *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal,* 27**,** 271-280.
MARKOVÁ, I. 1991. *Asymmetries in group conversations between a tutor and people with learning difficulties,* Hemel Hempstead, Harvester Wheatsheaf.
MARSH, S. 2011. The culture of hatred for the disabled comes from the top. *The Guardian*, Friday 16 September 2011.
MARTIN, J. A. 2015. Research with adults with Asperger's syndrome—participatory or emancipatory research? *Qualitative Social Work,* 14**,** 209-223.
MARTINEZ, F. 2012. *Francesca Martinez: Empty words don't fund a full life for disabled people* [Online]. London: Independent. Available: http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/commentators/francesca-martinez-empty-words-dont-fund-a-full-life-for-disabled-people-8100582.html [Accessed 22/09/2012 2012].
MASON, J. 1996. *Qualitative Researching,* London, Sage.
MASON, P. 1955-1964. Summary notes on the Le Court residents meeting. Cheshire, England: Leonard Cheshire and Le Court Cheshire Home.
MASTROIANNI, D. 2002. *Hegemony in Gramsci*, https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/postcolonialstudies/2014/06/20/hegemony-in-gramsci/.

MATTOCKS, K. & BRISCOE-PALMER, S. 2016. diversity, inclusion, and doctoral study: challenges facing minority phd students in the United Kingdom. *European Political Science,* 15**,** 476-492.
MAWDSLEY, H. & LEWIS, D. 2017. Lean and mean: how NPM facilitates the bullying of UK employees with long-term health conditions. *Public Money & Management,* 37**,** 317-324.
MAXWELL, G. A. 2004. Minority report: Taking the initiative in managing diversity at BBC Scotland. *Employee Relations,* 26**,** 182-202.
MAYNARD, C., S & MAYNARD, L., S 2000. Bureaucratic Barriers to Normal day-to-day Activities. *London: Muscle Power*.
MAYO, P. 2014. Antonio Gramsci's Impact on Critical Pedagogy. *Critical Sociology*.
MAZZETTI, A. S. 2018. The Emotional Nature of Qualitative Research. *In:* CIESIELSKA, M. & JEMIELNIAK, D. (eds.) *Qualitative Methodologies in Organization Studies: Volume I: Theories and New Approaches.* Cham: Springer International Publishing.
MCBRIDE, A., HEBSON, G. & HOLGATE, J. 2015. Intersectionality: are we taking enough notice in the field of work and employment relations? *Work, Employment and Society,* 29**,** 331-341.
MCCOLL, M. A., ADAIR, W., DAVEY, S. & KATES, N. 2013. The Learning Collaborative: An approach to emancipatory research in disability studies. *Canadian Journal of Disability Studies,* 2**,** 23.
MCDONALD, K., KIDNEY, C. & PATKA, M. 2013. 'You need to let your voice be heard': research participants' views on research. *Journal of Intellectual Disability Research,* 57**,** 216-225.
MCDOUGALL, M. 1996. Equal opportunities versus managing diversity: Another challenge for public sector management? *International Journal of Public Sector Management,* 9**,** 62-72.
MCFARLIN, D., SONG, J. & SONNTAG, M. 1991. Integrating the disabled into the work force: A survey of fortune 500 company attitudes and practices. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal,* 4**,** 107-123.
MEIER, S. & STUTZER, A. 2008. Is Volunteering Rewarding in Itself? *Economica,* 75**,** 39-59.
MERCER, G. 2002. Emancipatory disability research. *In:* BARNES, C., OLIVER, M., . & BARTON, L. (eds.) *Disability Studies Today.* Cambridge: Polity.
MERCIECA, D. & MERCIECA, D. 2010. Opening research to intensities: Rethinking disability research with Deleuze and Guattari. *Journal of Philosophy of Education,* 44**,** 79-92.
MIES, M. 1999. Towards a methodology for feminist research. *Qualitative research,* 4**,** 66-85.
MIES, M., BOWLES, G. & KLEIN, R. D. 1980. *Theories of Women's Studies*, University of California, Women's Studies.
MILLER, D. 1994. The Management of Diversity: A Big Idea whose time has come? *Discussion Papers in Work and Employment.* University of Northumbria at Newcastle.
MILLER, E. J. & GWYNNE, G. V. 1972. *A life apart: A pilot study of residential institutions for the physically handicapped and the young chronic sick,* London, Taylor & Francis.
MILLIKEN, F. J. & MARTINS, L. L. 1996. Searching for common threads: Understanding the multiple effects of diversity in organizational groups. *Academy of management review***,** 402-433.
MILLS, A. J., TANCRED, P. & KORABIK, K. 1993. Gendering organizational analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 14**,** 705-707.
MINSKOFF, E. H., SAUTTER, S. W., HOFFMANN, F. J. & HAWKS, R. 1987. Employer Attitudes Toward Hiring the Learning Disabled. *Journal of Learning Disabilities,* 20**,** 53-57.
MOL 1946. *From Disability to Ability,* London, Ministry of Labour and National
MONTERO, A. 2017. What does Brexit mean for people with disabilities? *The Guardian*.
MOON, J. 2013. Business Social Responsibility. *Philosophy of Management,* 1**,** 35-45.
MOORE, J., SANDERS, J. & HIGHAM, L. 2013. Literature review of research into widening participation to higher education. *Bristol: HEFCE Available from https://www. offa. org. uk/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Literature-review-of-research-into-WP-to-HE. pdf [Accessed: 14th April 2016]*.
MOORE, M., BEAZLEY, S. & MAELZER, J. 1998. *Researching Disability Issues.,* Buckingham, Open University Press.
MORGAN, G. 1997. *Images of organization,* Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.
MORGAN, G. & SMIRCICH, L. 1980. The case for qualitative research. *Academy of management review***,** 491-500.

MORGAN, K. E. 2017. *Introducing the employee into employee silence: a reconceptualisation of employee silence from the perspective of those with mental health issues within the workplace.* University of Leeds.
MORRELL, J. 1990. *The employment of people with disabilities: research into the policies and practices of employers*, Department of Employment London.
MORRIS, J. 1991a. *Pride against prejudice,* London, Women's Press.
MORRIS, J. 1991b. *Pride against prejudice: Personal Politics of Disability,* London, Women's Press.
MORRIS, J. 1992. Personal and political: a feminist perspective on researching physical disability. *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 7**,** 157-166.
MORRIS, J. 1993a. Feminism and Disability. *Feminist Review***,** 57-70.
MORRIS, J. 1993b. Independent Lives? Community care and disabled people. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
MORRIS, J. 1996. *Encounters with strangers: Feminism and disability,* London, Women's Press.
MORRIS, J. Feminism, gender and disability. a seminar in Sydney, Australia February, 1998. http://disability-studies.leeds.ac.uk/library/.
MORRIS, J. 2001. Social exclusion and young disabled people with high levels of support needs. *Critical Social Policy,* 21**,** 161-183.
MORRIS, J. 2005. Citizenship and disabled people: A scoping paper prepared for the Disability Rights Commission. *Leeds: Disability Archive UK*.
MORRIS, J. 2008. *Inside the belly of the beast: the social model of disability and government policy* [Online]. Lancaster University. Available: http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/search/?q=Inside+the+belly+of+the+beast%3A+the+social+model+of+disability+and+government+policy [Accessed 25/06/2016 2016].
MORRIS, J. 2013. Welfare Reform and Social Model of Disability. *http://jennymorrisnet.blogspot.co.uk/2013/09/welfare-reform-and-socialmodel-of.html* [Online]. [Accessed 11/09/2013 2013].
MORRIS, J. 2014. Independence. Available from: http://jennymorrisnet.blogspot.co.uk/2014/09/independence.html 2014].
MORRISON, E. W. & MILLIKEN, F. J. 2000. Organizational silence: A barrier to change and development in a pluralistic world. *Academy of Management review,* 25**,** 706-725.
MOTTIER, V. 2005. The Interpretive Turn: History, Memory, and Storage in Qualitative Research. *2005,* 6.
MOUFFE, C. 2014. *Gramsci and Marxist Theory (RLE: Gramsci)*, Routledge.
MULHOLLAND, G. 2004. Managing Diversity: Linking Theory and Practice to Business Performance. *Managing diversity.* London.
MULLIGAN, D. The Future of Global Disability Research. The Future of Global Disability Research, 2010. University College London.
MULTON, K. D., BROWN, S. D. & LENT, R. W. 1991. Relation of self-efficacy beliefs to academic outcomes: A meta-analytic investigation. *Journal of Counseling Psychology,* 38**,** 30-38.
MUMBY, D. K. 1987. The political function of narrative in organizations. *Communication Monographs,* 54**,** 113-127.
MUNFORD, R. 1989. *The hidden costs of caring: women who care for people with intellectual disabilities: a thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Massey University.* Massey University.
MUNFORD, R. 1994. The politics of caregiving. *Disability is not measles: New research paradigms in disability***,** 265-284.
MUYIA, N., FREDRICK, ROESSLER, R. T. & KACIREK, K. 2010. Disability as a Diversity Factor: Implications for Human Resource Practices. *Advances in Developing Human Resources,* 12**,** 395-406.
MUZZATTI, S. L. & SAMARCO, C. V. 2005. *Reflections from the wrong side of the tracks: Class, identity, and the working class experience in academe*, Rowman & Littlefield.
NAMATOVU, R., DAWA, S., MULIRA, F. & KATONGOLE, C. 2012. Entrepreneurs with disability in Uganda. Kampala, Uganda: Makerere University Business School, ICBE-RF.

NEEDELS, K. E. & SCHMITZ, R. 2006. *Economic and social costs and benefits to employers of retaining, recruiting and employing disabled people and/or people with health conditions or an injury: A review of the evidence*, Corporate Document Services.
NEVILLE-JAN, A. 2004. Selling your soul to the devil: an autoethnography of pain, pleasure and the quest for a child. *Disability & Society,* 19**,** 113-127.
NICHOLLI, O. 1990. Menstruum quasi monstruum; monstrcus births and menstrual taboo in the sixteenth century. *Sex and Gender in Historical Perspective Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.*
NODDINGS, N. 1990. Ethics from the standpoint of women. *In:* RHODE, D. L. (ed.) *Theoretical Perspectives on Sexual Differences.* New Haven: Yale University Press.
NOG 1996. *The Disability Discrimination Act: A Policy and Practice Guide for Local Government and Disabled People,* Sheffield, Northern Officers Group.
NOON, M. 2007. The fatal flaws of diversity and the business case for ethnic minorities. *Work, employment and society,* 21**,** 773-784.
NOON, M. 2018. Pointless diversity training: Unconscious bias, new racism and agency. *Work, employment and society,* 32**,** 198-209.
NORWICH, B. 2013. *Addressing tensions and dilemmas in inclusive education: Living with uncertainty*, Routledge.
NOWOTNY, H. 2015. *Time: The modern and postmodern experience*, John Wiley & Sons.
NSW. 2013. *Developing good workplace policies – information for employers* [Online]. Available: http://www.industrialrelations.nsw.gov.au/biz_res/oirwww/pdfs/FactSheet_Policies.pdf [Accessed 12/01/2018 2018].
O'CONNELL, O. 2014. *Exploring the policy to practice gap: Social workers' experience of embedding child protection policy into their practice.* National University of Ireland.
OAKLEY, A. 1981. Interviewing Women: A Contradiction in terms. *In:* ROBERTS, H. (ed.) *Doing Feminist Research.* London: Routledge and Kegan.
OECD 1998. *UK Universities: Impact on Institutional Management and Decision Making of External Quality Assessment,* England, The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
OHRI, M. 2011. Online Equalities Training – can it really work? *Organisation and Social Development Consultants* [Online]. Available from: http://www.osdc.co.uk/online-equalities-training-can-it-really-work/ [Accessed 1/11/ 2017 2017].
OLDHAM, G. R. & HACKMAN, J. R. 1981. Relationships Between Organizational Structure and Employee Reactions: Comparing Alternative Frameworks. *Administrative Science Quarterly,* 26**,** 66-83.
OLIVER & BARNES, C. 1997a. All We Are Saying is Give Disabled Researchers a Chance. *Disability & Society,* 12**,** 811-814.
OLIVER, M. 1984. The politics of disability. *Critical Social Policy,* 4**,** 21-32.
OLIVER, M. 1986. Social policy and disability: some theoretical issues. *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 1**,** 5-17.
OLIVER, M. 1990a. The individual and social model of disability. *Joint Workshop of the Living Options Group and the Research Unit of the Royal College of Physicians.* Thames: Polytechnic.
OLIVER, M. 1990b. *The Politics of Disablement,* London, Macmillan.
OLIVER, M. 1992. Changing the Social Relations of Research Production. *Disability, Handicap and Society,* 7**,** 101-115.
OLIVER, M. 1996a. *Defining impairment and disability: Issues at stake,* Leeds, The Disability Press.
OLIVER, M. 1996b. *Understanding disability: from theory to practice,* Basingstoke, Macmillan.
OLIVER, M. 1997. Emancipatory research: realistic goal or impossible dream? *In:* BARNES, C. & MERCER, G. (eds.) *Doing Disability Research.* Leeds: The Disability Press.
OLIVER, M. 1998a. *Disability Research: Politics, Policy and Praxis,* Bournemouth, University of Greenwich.
OLIVER, M. 1998b. Theories of disability in health practice and research. *BMJ: British Medical Journal,* 317**,** 1446.

OLIVER, M. 2004a. If I had a hammer: The social model in action. *Disabling barriers–Enabling environments,* 2**,** 7-12.
OLIVER, M. 2013. The social model of disability: thirty years on. *Disability & Society,* 28**,** 1024-1026.
OLIVER, M. 2017. Defining impairment and disability. *In:* ELIZABETH, E. (ed.) *Disability and Equality Law.* London: Routledge.
OLIVER, M. & BARNES, C. 1997b. All We Are Saying is Give Disabled Researchers a Chance. *Disability & Society,* 12**,** 811-813.
OLIVER, M. & BARNES, C. 1997c. All We Are Saying is Give Disabled Researchers a Chance. *Disability & Society,* 12**,** 811-814.
OLIVER, M. & BARNES, C. 1997d. Current Issues: All We Are Saying is Give Disabled Researchers a Chance. *Disability & Society,* 12**,** 811-814.
OLIVER, M. & BARNES, C. 1998. Social policy and disabled people: From exclusion to inclusion. London: Longman.
OLIVER, M. & BARNES, C. 2008. 'Talking about us without us?'. A response to Neil Crowther. *Disability & Society,* 23**,** 397-399.
OLIVER, M. & BARNES, C. 2010. Disability studies, disabled people and the struggle for inclusion. *British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 31**,** 547-560.
OLIVER, M. & SAPEY, B. 1983. *Social work with disabled people,* London, Macmillan.
OLIVER, M., SAPEY, B. & THOMAS, P. 2012. *Social work with disabled people*, Palgrave Macmillan.
OLIVER, M. & ZARB, G. 1989. The Politics of Disability: A New Approach. *Disability, Handicap & Society,* 4**,** 221-239.
OLIVER, M. J. 2004b. Capitalism, disability, and ideology. *In:* MITCHELL, D. R. (ed.) *Special Educational Needs and Inclusive Education: Systems and contexts.* London: RoutledgeFarmer.
OLKIN, R. 2002. Could you hold the door for me? Including disability in diversity. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology,* 8**,** 130.
OLNEY, M. F. & BROCKELMAN, K. F. 2003. Out of the Disability Closet: Strategic use of perception management by select university students with disabilities. *Disability & Society,* 18**,** 35-50.
ONS. 2019. *Office for National Statistics: People with disabilities in the labour market* [Online]. London: Office for National Statistics. Available: https://www.ons.gov.uk/employmentandlabourmarket/peopleinwork/employmentandemployeetypes/datasets/labourmarketstatusofdisabledpeoplea08 [Accessed 13/08/19 2019].
ORLANS, H. 1972. Criteria of choice in social science research. *Minerva,* 10**,** 571-602.
OVERBOE, J. 1999. Difference in itself: Validating disabled people's lived experience. *Body Society,* 5**,** 17-29.
OWENS, J. 2015. Exploring the critiques of the social model of disability: the transformative possibility of Arendt's notion of power. *Sociology of Health & Illness,* 37**,** 385-403.
PACIFICORP. 2013. *Workplace Inclusion: A Business Objective* [Online]. Subsidiary of MidAmerican Energy Holdings Company. Available: http://www.pacificorp.com/car/ow/wiabo.html [Accessed 22/12/2013 2013].
PADGETT, D. K. 2016. *Qualitative methods in social work research*, Sage Publications.
PADILLA, R. 2007. Does seniority equal entitlement? Available from: https://www.techrepublic.com/blog/tech-decision-maker/does-seniority-equal-entitlement/ [Accessed 11/11/2007 2007].
PAEZ, P. & ARENDT, S. W. 2014. Managers' Attitudes Towards People with Disabilities in the Hospitality Industry. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration,* 15**,** 172-190.
PAGEL, M. 1988. *On Our Own Behalf- An Introduction to the Self Organisation of Disabled People,* Manchester, GMCDP.
PAGER, D. & KARAFIN, D. 2009. Bayesian Bigot? Statistical Discrimination, Stereotypes, and Employer Decision Making. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science,* 621**,** 70-93.
PALEY, J. 2002. The Cartesian melodrama in nursing. *Nursing Philosophy,* 3**,** 139.

PARKER, L. 1984. Control in Organizational Life: The Contribution of Mary Parker Follett. *Academy of Management Review,* 9**,** 736 - 745.
PATERSON, K. 2001. Disability Studies and Phenomenology: Finding a Space for both the Carnal and the Political. *Exploring the body.* Springer.
PATERSON, K. & HUGHES, B. 1999. Disability Studies and Phenomenology: The carnal politics of everyday life. *Disability & Society,* 14**,** 597-610.
PATRICK, H. A. & KUMAR, V. R. 2012. Managing Workplace Diversity: Issues and Challenges. *SAGE Open*.
PAYNE, S. 2010. Advantages of hiring disabled workers. *Helium.* http://www.helium.com/.
PECK, S. 2012. Doors Closed to Accessible Housing. *Disability Now*.
PEIRCE, E., SMOLINSKI, C. A. & ROSEN, B. 1998. Why sexual harassment complaints fall on deaf ears. *The Academy of Management Executive,* 12**,** 41-54.
PELKA, F. 2012. *What We Have Done: An Oral History of the Disability Rights Movement*, University of Massachusetts Press.
PENNYCOOK, G. & BARR, N. 2018. Why reason matters: Connecting research on human reason to the challenges of the Anthropocene. *The New Reflectionism in Cognitive Psychology.* Routledge.
PENTLAND, B. T. 1999. Building process theory with narrative: From description to explanation. *Academy of management Review,* 24**,** 711-724.
PERKS, R. 2010. The Roots of Oral History: Exploring Contrasting Attitudes to Elite, Corporate, and Business Oral History in Britain and the U.S. *Oral History Review*.
PERKS, R. & THOMSON, A. 2015. *The oral history reader,* Oxon, UK, Routledge.
PETERSON, P. A. & QUARSTEIN, V. A. 2001. Disability awareness training for disability professionals. *Disability and Rehabilitation,* 23**,** 43-48.
PFEFFER, J. 1992. *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations,* Harvard, Harvard Business Press.
PLATT, J. 1981. Evidence and proof in documentary research: 1 Some specific problems of documentary research. *The Sociological Review,* 29**,** 31-52.
POLCZYK, P. Autoethnography as an Accessible Method of Research. Forum Oświatowe, 2012. Dolnośląska Szkoła Wyższa.
POLKINGHORNE, D. E. 1995. Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *International journal of qualitative studies in education,* 8**,** 5-23.
POMPPER, D. 2013. Diversity Matters: Harnessing the Power of Diversity for Your Organization. *Workplace Communication for the 21st Century: Tools and Strategies that Impact the Bottom Line***,** 131.
POWELL, A. 2019. House of Commons Library: briefing paper: Number 06113, 11 February 2019: Apprenticeship Statistics: England.
PRICE, J. & SHILDRICK, M. 1998. Uncertain thoughts on the dis/abled body. *Vital signs: Feminist reconfigurations of the bio/logical body***,** 224-249.
PRICHARD, C. & BENSCHOP, Y. 2018. It's time for Acting Up! *Organization,* 25**,** 98-105.
PRIESTLEY, M. 1997. Who's research?: a personal audit. *In:* MERCER, G. & BARNES, C. (eds.) *Doing Disability Research.* Leeds: The Disability Press.
PRIESTLEY, M. 1998. Constructions and creations: idealism, materialism and disability theory. *Disability & Society,* 13**,** 75-94.
PRIESTLEY, M. 1999. Book Reviews. *Disability & Society,* 14**,** 581-589.
PRIESTLEY, M. 2004. *Disablity: a life course approach,* Cambridge, Polity.
RABINOW, P. & SULLIVAN, W. M. 1987. *Interpretive social science: A second look*, Univ of California Press.
RABIONET, S. E. 2011. How I learned to design and conduct semi-structured interviews: An ongoing and continuous journey. *The Qualitative Report,* 16**,** 563.
RADFORD, J. P. 1994. Intellectual disability and the heritage of modernity. *Disability is not measles: New research paradigms in disability***,** 9-28.

RAE. 2008. *Research Assessment Exercise (RAE) results, 2008* [Online]. 2014. Available: https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/research-assessment-exercise-rae-results-2008/404786.article [Accessed 22/2/2014].
RAINBIRD, H., LEESON, E. & MUNRO, A. 2011. Is regulation good for skill development? Mediating actors and workplace practice in adult social care in England. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management,* 22**,** 3727-3741.
RAMOS, V. 1982. The Concepts of Ideology, Hegemony, and Organic Intellectuals in Gramsci's Marxism. *Theoretical Review,* 30**,** 34.
REAY, D. 1996. Insider perspectives or stealing the words out of women's mouths: interpretation in the research process. *Feminist Review,* 53.
REED-DANAHAY 1997a. *Auto/ethnography: rewriting the self and the social,* New York, Berg.
REED-DANAHAY, D. 1997b. Introduction. *In:* REED-DANAHAY, D. (ed.) *Auto/ethnography: rewriting the self and the social.* New York: Berg.
REED-DANAHAY, D. E. 1997c. *Auto/ethnography*, Berg New York.
REED, A. 2018. *Without justice for all: The new liberalism and our retreat from racial equality*, Routledge.
REES, G. & SMITH, P. 2017. *Strategic human resource management: An international perspective*, Sage.
REF. 2014. *The Research Excellence Framework 2014* [Online]. UK: The Research Excellence Framework (REF). Available: http://www.ref.ac.uk/ [Accessed 12/04/2016 2016].
REINHARZ, S. 1992. *Feminist Methods in Social Research,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
REMENYI, D. & WILLIAMS, B. 1998. *Doing research in business and management: an introduction to process and method*, Sage.
RHODES, C. & BROWN, A. D. 2005. Narrative, organizations and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 7**,** 167-188.
RIBBENS, J. 1989. Interviewing—An "unnatural situation"? *Women's Studies International Forum,* 12**,** 579-592.
RICHARD, O. C. 2000. Racial diversity, business strategy, and firm performance: A resource-based view. *Academy of Management Journal,* 43**,** 164-177.
RICHARD, O. C. & JOHNSON, N. B. 2001. Understanding the impact of human resource diversity practices on firm performance. *Journal of Managerial Issues,* 13**,** 177-195.
RICHARD, R. 2004. *Disabling Imagery? A teaching guide to disability and moving image media*, Disability Equality in Education, www.diseed.org.uk based on a project of DEE and BFI to create a website and DVD with a grant from the Department of Work and Pensions under European Year of Disabled People 2003.
RICHARDS, R. 2008. Writing the Othered Self: Autoethnography and the Problem of Objectification in Writing About Illness and Disability. *Qualitative Health Research,* 18**,** 1717-1728.
RICHARDSON, L. 1992. The consequences of poetic representation. *Investigating subjectivity: Research on lived experience***,** 125-137.
RIDDELL, S. 2009. Social justice, equality and inclusion in Scottish education. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* 30**,** 283-296.
RIOUX, M., H. & BACH, M. 1994. *Disability is Not Measles: New research paradigms in disability,* Ontario, Roeher Institute.
RIOUX, M. H., PINTO, P. C. & PAREKH, G. 2015. *Disability, Rights Monitoring, and Social Change*, Canadian Scholars' Press.
RITCHIE, D. A. 2014. *Doing oral history*, Oxford University Press.
ROBINSON, M. G. 2013. *The Inclusion Revolution Is Now: An Innovative Framework for Diversity and Inclusion in the Workplace*, iUniverse.
ROCCO, T. S. 2001. Helping Adult Educators Understand Disability Disclosure. *Adult learning,* 12**,** 10-12.
ROSE, M. 1975. *Industrial behaviour: theoretical development since Taylor*, Allen Lane London.
ROSE, M. 1988. *Industrial Behaviour (research and control)*, Penguin.

ROSS, R. & SCHNEIDER, R. 1992. *From equality to diversity: A business case for equal opportunities*, Pitman - Affirmative action programs
ROSSMAN, G., B. & RALLIS, S., F., 1998. *Learning in the Field: An Introduction to Qualitative Research,* UK, Sage Publications Inc.
ROTHMANN, I. & COOPER, C. L. 2015. *Work and organizational psychology*, Routledge.
ROULSTONE, A. 1998. Society: The Case of Employment and New Technology. *In:* SHAKESPEARE, T. (ed.) *Disability Reader: Social Science Perspectives.* London: Continuum.
ROULSTONE, A. 2002. Disabling Pasts, Enabling Futures? How Does the Changing Nature of Capitalism Impact on the Disabled Worker and Jobseeker? *Disability & Society,* 17**,** 627-642.
ROULSTONE, A. 2003. The Legal Road to Rights? Disabling Premises, Obiter Dicta and the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. *Disability & Society,* 18**,** 117-131.
ROULSTONE, A. 2012a. Incapacitated? Just who is to blame for the Disability Employment Problem? University of Westminster.
ROULSTONE, A. 2012b. The Paralympic Legacy – A New Dawn or a False Dawn for Disabled People? *The Policy Press.* The Policy Press.
ROULSTONE, A. 2015. Personal independence payments, welfare reform and the shrinking disability category. *Disability & Society,* 30**,** 673-688.
ROULSTONE, A., GRADWELL, L. & BREAKTHROUGH, U. 2004. *Thriving and surviving at work: Disabled peoples' employment strategies* [Online]. Available: http://www.lenus.ie/hse/bitstream/10147/264252/1/Delivering%20Change%20Through%20Disability%20Research%2019%20Oct.%202004.pdf#page=108 [Accessed].
ROWAN, J. 1981. A Dialectical Paradigm for Research. *In:* REASON, P. & ROWAN, J. (eds.) *Human Inquiry: A Sourcebook of New Paradigm Research.* Chichester: John Wiley.
ROWLEY-JOLIVET, E. Science in the making: Scientific conference presentations and the construction of facts. English as a Conference Language in Europe. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2002.
RSBC. 2013. *1920 Blind Persons Act* [Online]. London: Royal Society for Blind Children. Available: http://www.rsbc.org.uk/history/1920-blind-persons-act/ [Accessed 14/01/2018 2018].
RUDDICK, S. 1995. *Maternal thinking: Toward a politics of peace,* New York, Beacon Press.
RUDESTAM, K. E. & NEWTON, R. R. 2014. *Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide to content and process*, Sage Publications.
RUSSELL, D. 2006. Employer willingness to consider workplace adjustments for people with mental health problems. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, Employment and Disability,* 8**,** 211-228.
RYAN, J., AND THOMAS, F. 1987. *The Politics of Mental Handicap*, Free Association Books, London.
SADLER, G. R., LEE, H.-C., LIM, R. S.-H. & FULLERTON, J. 2010. Research Article: Recruitment of hard-to-reach population subgroups via adaptations of the snowball sampling strategy. *Nursing & Health Sciences,* 12**,** 369-374.
SALDAÑA, J. 2015. *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*, Sage.
SALIH, F. A. & AL-KANDARI, H. Y. 2007. Effect of a Disability Course on Prospective Educators' Attitudes Toward Individuals with Mental Retardation. *Digest of Middle East Studies,* 16**,** 12-29.
SALLACH, D. L. 1974. Class Domination and Ideological Hegemony*. *Sociological Quarterly,* 15**,** 38-50.
SAMUELS, E. J. 2003. My Closet: Invisible Disability and the Limits of Coming-Out Discourse. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies,* 9**,** 233-255.
SANDBERG, J. & H.TSOUKAS 2011. Grasping the Logic of Practice: Theorizing Through Practical Rationality. *Academy of Management Review,* 36**,** 338-360.
SANDELOWSKI, M. 1991. Telling stories: Narrative approaches in qualitative research. *Journal of nursing scholarship,* 23**,** 161-166.
SANDHYA, K. & KUMAR, D. P. 2011. Employee retention by motivation. *Indian Journal of science and technology,* 4**,** 1778-1782.
SASSOON, A. S. 1982. *Approaches to Gramsci,* London, Writers and Readers Pub. Cooperative Society.

SAUNDERS, M. N., SAUNDERS, M., LEWIS, P. & THORNHILL, A. 2011. *Research Methods For Business Students, 5/e*, Pearson Education India.
SAUNDERS, S. L. & NEDELEC, B. 2014. What work means to people with work disability: a scoping review. *Journal of occupational rehabilitation,* 24**,** 100-110.
SAYCE, L. 2011. *Getting in, staying in and getting on: disability employment support fit for the future*, Stationery Office.
SCAMBLER, G. 2004. Re-framing stigma: felt and enacted stigma and challenges to the sociology of chronic and disabling conditions. *Social Theory & Health,* 2**,** 29-46.
SCHNEIDER, D. J. 2005. *The psychology of stereotyping,* New York, Guilford Press.
SCHUCHMAN, J. S. 1984. Silent Movies and the Deaf Communit. *Journal of Popular Culture,* 17**,** 58-78.
SCHUR, L. 2002. The difference a job makes: The effects of employment among people with disabilities. *Journal of Economic Issues***,** 339-347.
SCHUR, L., KRUSE, D. & BLANCK, P. 2005. Corporate culture and the employment of persons with disabilities. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law,* 23**,** 3-20.
SCHUR, L., KRUSE, D. & BLANCK, P. 2013. *People with disabilities: Sidelined or mainstreamed?,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
SCHWANDT, T. A. 1994. Constructivist, interpretivist approaches to human inquiry. *Handbook of qualitative research,* 1**,** 118-137.
SCHWARTZ, B. The paradox of choice. 2004. Ecco New York.
SCOTT-PARKER, S. & ZADEK, S. 2001a. Managing diversity: A key factor in improving efficiency, productivity, and overall business success. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation,* 16**,** 119-123.
SCOTT-PARKER, S. & ZADEK, S. Unlocking the evidence: the new disability business case. 2001b London. Employers' Forum on disability, www. employers-forum. co. uk.
SCOTT, R. A. 1981. *The making of blind men: A study of adult socialization*, Transaction Publishers.
SEARLE, G. R. 1979. Eugenics and politics in Britain in the 1930s. *Annals of Science,* 36**,** 159-169.
SEDLACEK, W. E. 2007. *Conducting research that makes a difference in Counseling for social justice,* Alexandria, VA. American, Counseling Association.
SELDEN, S. C. & SELDEN, F. 2001. Rethinking Diversity in Public Organizations for the 21st Century: Moving toward a Multicultural Model. *Administration & Society,* 33**,** 303-329.
SEN, S. & BHATTACHARYA, C. B. 2001. Does doing good always lead to doing better? Consumer reactions to corporate social responsibility. *Journal of marketing Research,* 38**,** 225-243.
SEYMOUR, W. 2007. Exhuming the body: Revisiting the role of the visible body in ethnographic research. *Qualitative Health Research,* 17**,** 1188-1197.
SHAH, A. K. 2012. The costs of discrimination. *https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/equityDiversityInclusion/2012/03/the-costs-of-discrimination/* [Online]. [Accessed 06/03/2012 2012].
SHAH, S. 2005. *Career success of disabled high-flyers*, Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
SHAH, S. 2006. Sharing the world: the researcher and the researched. *Qualitative Research,* 6**,** 207-220.
SHAKESPEARE, T. 1994a. Cultural Representation of Disabled People: Dustbins for Disavowal? *Disability & Society,* 9**,** 283-299.
SHAKESPEARE, T. 1996. Rules of engagement: doing disability research. *Disability & Society,* 11**,** 115-119.
SHAKESPEARE, T. 1998. *Disability Reader: Social Science Perspectives*, Continuum.
SHAKESPEARE, T. 2006a. *Disability Rights and Wrongs,* London, Routledge.
SHAKESPEARE, T. 2006b. The social model of disability. *The disability studies reader,* 2**,** 197-204.
SHAKESPEARE, T. 2008. Debating disability. *Journal of Medical Ethics,* 34**,** 11-14.
SHAKESPEARE, T. & WATSON, N. 2001. The social model of disability: an outdated ideology? *Research in social science and disability,* 2**,** 9-28.
SHAKESPEARE, T. & WATSON, N. 2004. The social model of disability: an outdated ideology? *Research in Social Science and Disability***,** 9-28.

SHAKESPEARE, T. W. 1994b. *Conceptualising disability: impairment in sociological perspective.* University of Cambridge.
SHARIFI, S. 2002. Ticking time and side cupboard: The journey of a patient. *ADVANCES IN ORGANIZATION STUDIES,* 11**,** 215-236.
SHELBY-CAFFEY, C., BYFIELD, L. & UBÉDA, E. 2015. Black sheep" in the ivory tower: Academics of color explore racial battle fatigue and microaggressions in "post-racial America. *Racial Battle Fatigue: Insights from the Front Lines of Social Justice Advocacy: Insights from the Front Lines of Social Justice Advocacy***,** 141.
SHELDON, A. 2001. *Disabled People and Communication Systems in the Twenty First Century.* PhD, The University of Leeds.
SHELDON, A. 2005. One World, One People, One Struggle? Towards the global implementation of the social model of disability. *In:* BARNES, C. A. M., G. (ed.) *The Social Model of Disability: Europe and the Majority World.* Leeds: The Disability Press.
SHELDON, A. Disabling the Disabled People's Movement? The influence of Disability Studies on the struggle for liberation. Keynote address at the 3rd Disability Studies Association Conference, Lancaster: Lancaster University, 18th September, 2006.
SHEMLA, M., MEYER, B., GREER, L. & JEHN, K. A. 2016. A review of perceived diversity in teams: Does how members perceive their team's composition affect team processes and outcomes? *Journal of Organizational Behavior,* 37.
SHEPHERD, S. 2017. Why are there so few female leaders in higher education:A case of structure or agency? *Management in Education,* 31**,** 82-87.
SHERIF, M. 2017. *Social interaction: Process and products*, Routledge.
SHEVLIN, M., KENNY, M. & MCNEELA, E. 2004. Participation in higher education for students with disabilities: an Irish perspective. *Disability & Society,* 19**,** 15-30.
SHORE, L. M., CHUNG-HERRERA, B. G., DEAN, M. A., EHRHART, K. H., JUNG, D. I., RANDEL, A. E. & SINGH, G. 2009. Diversity in organizations: Where are we now and where are we going? *Human Resource Management Review,* 19**,** 117-133.
SHORE, L. M., RANDEL, A. E., CHUNG, B. G., DEAN, M. A., HOLCOMBE EHRHART, K. & SINGH, G. 2011. Inclusion and Diversity in Work Groups: A Review and Model for Future Research. *Journal of Management,* 37**,** 1262-1289.
SHUTTLEWORTH, M. 2008. Definition of research. *Experiment Resources*.
SIEGELMAN, P. 2014. The Compromised Worker and the Limits of Employment Discrimination Law. *Available at SSRN 2485927*.
SIGAFOOS, J. 2016. Using equality legislation as a sword. *International Journal of Discrimination and the Law,* 16**,** 66-82.
SILVERMAN, D. 2004. *Collegiality and service for tenure and beyond: Acquiring a reputation as a team player,* London, Praeger.
SILVERMAN, F. H. & PAYNTER, K. K. 1990. Impact of stuttering on perception of occupational competence. *Journal of Fluency Disorders,* 15**,** 87-91.
SIMON, R. 1982. *Gramsci's political thought*, Lawrence and Wishart London.
SIN, C. H., HEDGES, A., COOK, C., MGUNI, N. & COMBER, N. 2009. Disabled people's experiences of targeted violence and hostility. *Manchester: Equality and Human Rights Commission*.
SINCLAIR, A. 2006. Critical diversity management practice in Australia: Romanced or co-opted. *In:* A. KONRAD, P. P. & PRINGLE, J. (eds.) *Handbook of workplace diversity.* London: Sage.
SINCLAIR, J., BARNACLE, R. & CUTHBERT, D. 2014. How the doctorate contributes to the formation of active researchers: what the research tells us. *Studies in Higher Education,* 39**,** 1972-1986.
SINGH, M. P. 2006. *Quote Unquote: A Handbook of Quotations,* New Delhi, Lotus Press.
SIPERSTEIN, G. N., POCIASK, S. E. & COLLINS, M. A. 2010. Sticks, Stones, and Stigma: A Study of Students' Use of the Derogatory Term "Retard". *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities,* 48**,** 126-134.
SKEGGS, B. 1995. *Feminist cultural theory: Process and production*, Manchester University Press.
SMITH, D. E. 1974. Women's perspective as a radical critique of sociology. *Sociological inquiry,* 44**,** 7-13.

SMITH, D. E. 1987. *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*, University of Toronto Press.
SMITH, K., WEBBER, L., GRAFFAM, J. & WILSON, C. 2004. Employer satisfaction with employees with a disability: Comparisons with other employees. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation,* 21**,** 61-69.
SÖDER, M. 2009. Tensions, perspectives and themes in disability studies. *Scandinavian journal of disability research,* 11**,** 67-81.
SOKOYA, G. O. 2006. Self-reflexivity in gender research: The dilemma of an African feminist scholar. *Gender and Behaviour,* 4**,** 867-880.
SOORENIAN, A. 2012. Economic Austerity and disabled women. *Sisters of Frida.* London.
STAKE, R. 2005. Qualitative case studies. *In:* DENZIN, N. K. L., Y. S. (ed.) *Handbook of qualitative research.* London: Sage.
STANLEY, L. & WISE, S. 1993. *Breaking out again: Feminist ontology and epistemology*, Routledge.
STARK, B. 2009. *The Concept of Disability, or, 'perceiving our differences'* [Online]. Biology 202 Web Paper 2. Available: http://serendip.brynmawr.edu/exchange/node/4134 [Accessed].
STEWART, D. W. & SHAMDASANI, P. N. 2014. *Focus groups: Theory and practice*, Sage publications.
STEWART, J., HARRIS, J. & SAPEY, B. O. B. 1998. Truth or Manipulation? The Politics of Government-funded Disability Research. *Disability & Society,* 13**,** 297-300.
STONE, D. 1986. *Disabled State*, Temple University Press.
STONE, D. L. & COLELLA, A. 1996. A Model of Factors Affecting the Treatment of Disabled Individuals in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review,* 21**,** 352-401.
STONE, E. & PRIESTLEY, M. 1996. Parasites, Pawns and Partners: Disability Research and the Role of Non-Disabled Researchers. *The British Journal of Sociology of Education,* 47**,** 699-716.
STONE, E., STONE, D. & DIPBOYE, R. 1992. Stigmas in organizations: Race, handicaps, and physical unattractiveness. *In:* KELLEY, K. (ed.) *Issues, Theory, and Research in Industrial Organizational Psychology.* Amsterdam, Netherlands: Elsevier Science Publishers.
STRINATI, D. 2004. *An introduction to theories of popular culture,* London, Routledge.
STROMQUIST, N. P. & MONKMAN, K. 2014. Defining globalization and assessing its implications for knowledge and education, revisited. *Globalization and education: Integration and contestation across cultures,* 1.
STURGES, J. E. & HANRAHAN, K. J. 2004. Comparing telephone and face-to-face qualitative interviewing: a research note. *Qualitative Research,* 4**,** 107-118.
SULLIVAN, M. 1991. From personal tragedy to social oppression: The medical model and social theories of disability. *New Zealand Journal of Industrial Relations,* 16.
SUTER, R., SCOTT-PARKER, S. & ZADEK, S. 2007. Realising Potential: Disability Confidence Builds Better Business. *GLADNET Collection***,** 463.
SWAIN, J., FINKLESTIEN, V., FRENCH, S. & OLIVER, M. 2014. *Disabling Barriers - Enabling Environments,* London, SAGE.
SWAIN, J., FRENCH, S. & CAMERON, C. 2003. *Controversial issues in a disabling society*, McGraw-Hill Education (UK).
SYDOW, J. & SCHREYÖGG, G. 2015. Organizational path dependence. *International Encyclopedia of Social and Behavioral Sciences,* 2**,** 385-389.
TANAKA, K. 2007. *The Roots of the Social Model: A Life History of Paul Hunt,* Japan, Hokusei Gakuen University.
TATLI, A. 2011. A Multi-layered Exploration of the Diversity Management Field: Diversity Discourses, Practices and Practitioners in the UK. *British Journal of Management,* 22**,** 238-253.
THANEM, T. 2008. Embodying disability in diversity management research. *Equal Opportunities International,* 27**,** 581 - 595.
THE 2017. Disability on Campus: the challenges faced and change needed: Five academics talk about the issues associated with various disabilities and what should be done to improve support. *Times Higher Education.* THE: Times Higher Education.
THOMAS, C. 1999. *Female Forms: Experiencing and Understanding Disability,* Buckingham, Open University Press.

THOMAS, C. 2004a. *Developing the Social Relational in the Social Model of Disability: a theoretical agenda* Leeds, Disability Press
THOMAS, C. 2004b. How is disability understood? An examination of sociological approaches. *Disability & Society,* 19.
THOMAS, C. 2007a. Sociologies of Disability and Illness. *Contested Ideas in Disability Studies and Medical Sociology.* Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
THOMAS, C. 2007b. *Sociologies of disability and illness: Contested ideas in disability studies and medical sociology*, Macmillan International Higher Education.
THOMAS, D. 1982. The Experience of Handicap. London: Methuen.
THOMAS JR & ROOSEVELT, R. 1990. From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard business review,* 68**,** 107-117.
THOMAS JR, R. R. 1990. From affirmative action to affirming diversity. *Harvard business review,* 68**,** 107-117.
THOMAS, P. 2006. Modernity as "passive revolution": Gramsci and the Fundamental Concepts of Historical Materialism. *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association/Revue de la Société historique du Canada,* 17**,** 61-78.
THOMPSON, N. 2016. *Anti-discriminatory practice: Equality, diversity and social justice,* UK, Palgrave Macmillan.
THOMPSON, P. 1988. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.
THOMPSON, P., WILLA, K., BAUM, 1969. *Voice of the Past,* Nashville, Oral History for the Local History Society.
THOMPSON, R., RUSSELL, L. & SIMMONS, R. 2014. Space, place and social exclusion: an ethnographic study of young people outside education and employment. *Journal of Youth Studies,* 17**,** 63-78.
THOMSON, G., ROSEMARIE 2002. Integrating Disability, Transforming Feminist Theory. *NWSA Journal,* 14**,** 1-32.
THOMSON, R. G. 1997. *Extraordinary bodies: Figuring physical disability in American culture and literature*, Columbia University Press.
THOMSON, R. G. 2017. *Extraordinary bodies: Figuring physical disability in American culture and literature*, Columbia University Press.
THORNTON, P. & LUNT, N. 1995. *Employment for disabled people social obligation or individual responsibility?,* York, Social Policy Research Unit: University of York.
TILLMANN-HEALY, L. M. 1996. in a Culture of Thinness. *Composing ethnography: Alternative forms of qualitative writing,* 1**,** 76.
TITCHKOSKY, T. 2011. *The Question of Access: Disability, Space, Meaning,* Toronto, University of Toronto Press,.
TOMLINSON, F. & SCHWABENLAND, C. 2010. Reconciling Competing Discourses of Diversity? The UK Non-Profit Sector Between Social Justice and the Business Case. *Organization,* 17**,** 101-121.
TØSSEBRO, J. & KITTELSAA, A. 2004. Studying the living conditions of disabled people: approaches and problems. *Exploring the living conditions of disabled people***,** 17-43.
TOWNLEY, B. 1994. *Reframing human resource management: Power, ethics and the subject at work*, SAGE Publications Ltd.
TREGASKIS, C. 2004. *Constructions of disability: Researching the interface between disabled and non-disabled people*, Psychology Press.
TREGASKIS, C. & GOODLEY, D. 2005. Disability Research by Disabled and Non-Disabled People: Towards a Relational Methodology of Research Production. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology,* 8**,** 363-374.
TREIMAN, D. J. & HARTMANN, H. I. 1981. *Women, work, and wages: Equal pay for jobs of equal value*, National Academies Press.
TREMAIN, S. L. 2005. *Foucault and the government of disability*, University of Michigan Press.
TSOUKAS, H. & KNUDSEN, C. 2003. *The Oxford Handbook of Organization Theory. Meta-Theoretical Perspectives,* Oxford, Oxford University Press.

TURMUSANI, M. 2004. An Eclectic approach to Disability Research: A Majority World Perspective. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation Journal,* 15.
TURNER, B. S. 2008. *The Body and Society: Explorations in Social Theory,* London, Sage.
TYRER, A. 2012. *Can a disabled person be treated more favourably?* [Online]. Available: http://www.stammeringlaw.org.uk/discrimination/positivediscr.htm [Accessed 14/11/2018 2018].
UNGER, D. & KREGEL, J. 2003. Employers' knowledge and utilization of accommodations. *Work: A Journal of Prevention, Assessment and Rehabilitation,* 21**,** 5-15.
UPIAS 1976. *Union of the Physically Impaired Against Segregation], Fundamental Principles of Disability (London, Union of Physically Impaired against Segregation),* Leeds, UK, Disability Archive,.
UPPAL, S. 2005. Disability, workplace characteristics and job satisfaction. *International Journal of Manpower,* 26**,** 336-349.
VAN-MAANEN, J. 2011. *Tales of the field: On writing ethnography*, University of Chicago Press.
VAN KNIPPENBERG, D. & SCHIPPERS, M. C. 2007. Work group diversity. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.,* 58**,** 515-541.
VAN TEIJLINGEN, E. Semi-structured interviews. PGR Workshop December, 2014.
VANSINA, J. 1985. *Oral Tradition as History,* Wisconsin, University of Wisconsin Press.
VENTOLA, E., SHALOM, C. & THOMPSON, S. 2002. *The language of conferencing*, Peter Lang.
VERDICCHIO, P. 1995. Reclaiming Gramsci: A Brief Survey of Current and Potential Uses of the Work of Antonio Gramsci. *Symposium: A Quarterly Journal in Modern Literatures,* 49**,** 169-176.
VISCHER, J. 2005. *Space Meets Status: Designing Workplace Performance,* Abingdon, Routledge.
VON SCHRADER, S., MALZER, V. & BRUYÈRE, S. 2014. Perspectives on Disability Disclosure: The Importance of Employer Practices and Workplace Climate. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal,* 26**,** 237-255.
WALL, S. 2008. Easier said than done: Writing an autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods,* 7**,** 38-53.
WALLER, S., BRADLEY, M., HOSKING, I. & CLARKSON, P. J. 2015. Making the case for inclusive design. *Applied Ergonomics,* 46**,** 297-303.
WALLIMAN, N. 2004. *Your undergraduate dissertation: the essential guide for success,* London, Sage.
WARD, L. & FLYNN, M. 1994. What matters most: Disability research and Empowerment. *In:* RIOUX, M. & BACH, M. (eds.) *Disibility is Not Measles: New research paradigm in Disability.* The Roeher Institute.
WARNER, L. 2008. A Best Practices Guide to Intersectional Approaches in Psychological Research. *Sex Roles,* 59**,** 454-463.
WATSON, A., OWEN, G., AUBREY, J. & ELLIS, B. 1998. Integrating disabled employees: case studies of 40 employers. *LABOUR MARKET TRENDS,* 106**,** 399-401.
WATSON, S. D. 1993. Holistic Policymaking: “Neo-Liberalism” as Illustrated by the Women's and Disability Rights Movements. *Policy Studies Journal,* 21**,** 752-764.
WATSON, T., J., 2001. The emergent manager and processes of management prelearning. *Management Learning,* 32**,** 221-235.
WEBB, J. 1997. The Politics of Equal Opportunity. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 4**,** 159-169.
WEBER, M. 1964. *The theory of social and economic organization,* New York, Free Press.
WEBSTER, F. 2014. *Theories of the information society*, Routledge.
WEHMEYER, M. L. 2004. Self-determination and the empowerment of people with disabilities.
WENAR, L. 2013. *"John Rawls", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* [Online]. Stanford. Available: http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2013/entries/rawls/ [Accessed 22/11/2016 2016].
WENDELL, S. 1989. Toward a Feminist Theory of Disability. *Hypatia,* 4**,** 104-124.
WESTCOTT, G. 2008. A route out of poverty? Disabled people, work and welfare reform. *The Journal of Poverty and Social Justice,* 16**,** 201.
WHEATLEY, E. 1994. Dances with Feminists: Truths, Dares and Ethnographic Stares. *Women's Studies International Forum,* 17**,** 421-3.

WHITTINGTON-WALSH, F. 2002. From Freaks to Savants: Disability and hegemony from The Hunchback of Notre Dame (1939) to Sling Blade (1997). *Disability & Society,* 17**,** 695-707.
WIETHOFF, C. 2004. Motivation to learn and diversity training: Application of the theory of planned behavior. *Human Resource Development Quarterly,* 15**,** 263-278.
WILLIAM, L. C. 2016. The implementation of equality legislation: the case of disabled graduates and reasonable adjustments. *Industrial Relations Journal,* 47**,** 341-359.
WILLIAMS-WHITT, K. & TARAS, D. 2010. Disability and the Performance Paradox: Can Social Capital Bridge the Divide? *British Journal of Industrial Relations,* 48**,** 534-559.
WILLIAMS, F. 1989. *Social Policy: A critical introduction: Issues of race, gender, and class*, Polity.
WILLIAMS, J. 2011. *What can disabled academics'career experiences offer to studies of organization?* , Northumbria University.
WILLIAMS, J. & MAVIN, S. 2012. Disability as Constructed Difference: A Literature Review and Research Agenda for Management and Organization Studies. *International Journal of Management Reviews,* 14**,** 159-179.
WILLIAMS, J. & MAVIN, S. 2015. Impairment effects as a career boundary: a case study of disabled academics. *Studies in Higher Education,* 40**,** 123-141.
WILLIAMS, K. Y. & O'REILLY, C. A. 1998. Demography and diversity in organizations: A review of 40 years of research. *In:* SHAW, B. (ed.) *Research in organizational behavior.*
WILLIAMS, M. L., BURNAP, P., SLOAN, L., JESSOP, C. & LEPPS, H. 2017. Users' Views of Ethics in Social Media Research: Informed Consent, Anonymity, and Harm. *The Ethics of Online Research.* Emerald Publishing Limited.
WILLIS, J. 2007. History and Foundations of Interpretativist Research. *Foundations of Qualitative Research: Interpretative and Critical Approaches***,** 95-146.
WILSON-KOVACS, D., RYAN, M. K., HASLAM, S. A. & RABINOVICH, A. 2008. 'Just because you can get a wheelchair in the building doesn't necessarily mean that you can still participate': barriers to the career advancement of disabled professionals. *Disability & Society,* 23**,** 705-717.
WING, L. 1992. Manifestations of Social Problems in High-Functioning Autistic People. *In:* SCHOPLER, E. & MESIBOV, G. B. (eds.) *High-Functioning Individuals with Autism.* Boston, MA: Springer US.
WOLCOTT, H. F. 2002. *Sneaky kid and its aftermath: Ethics and intimacy in fieldwork*, Rowman Altamira.
WOODHAMS, C. & CORBY, S. 2003. Defining Disability in Theory and Practice: A Critique of the British Disability Discrimination Act 1995. *Journal of Social Policy,* 32**,** 159-178.
WOODHAMS, C. & CORBY, S. 2007. Then and Now: Disability Legislation and Employers' Practices in the UK. *British Journal of Industrial Relations,* 45**,** 556-580.
WOODHAMS, C. & DANIELI, A. 2000. Disability and diversity–a difference too far? *Personnel Review,* 29**,** 402-417.
WOODS, M. 2011. Interviewing for research and analysing qualitative data: An overview. *Massey University.*
WRENCH, J. 2005. Diversity management can be bad for you. *Race & Class,* 46**,** 73-84.
YBEMA, S., THOMAS, R. & HARDY, C. 2016. Organizational change and resistance: An identity perspective. *The SAGE Handbook of Resistance***,** 386.
YEO, R. & MOORE, K. 2003. Including Disabled People in Poverty Reduction Work: "Nothing About Us, Without Us". *World Development,* 31**,** 571-590.
YIN, R. K. 2017. *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*, Sage publications.
YOW, V. R. 1994. *Recording Oral History,* London, Sage.
YOW, V. R. 2014. *Recording oral history: A guide for the humanities and social sciences*, Rowman & Littlefield.
ZANONI, P. & JANSSENS, M. 2007. Minority Employees Engaging with (Diversity) Management: An Analysis of Control, Agency, and Micro-Emancipation*. *Journal of Management Studies,* 44**,** 1371-1397.
ZARB, G. 1995. Modelling the social model of disability. *Critical Public Health,* 6**,** 21-29.

Appendix One

Semi-structured interview schedule with HR Managers of the three University case-studies.

Organisational structure
Who leads on disability issues at University? Is there a specialist person on disability?
Who collects/gathers the statistical data for University in relation to disability?
Disability disclosure.
What statistics are collected? Recruitment, Promotion, Pay (disability pay gap), Sickness, absence, Any other areas? So, what about previous years? How do they normally publish their equality objectives? I only want numbers of the findings no names so there is no issue of confidentiality according to the Equality Duty.
How would you define disability in relation to the collection of statistical data? You're disabled under the Equality Act 2010 if you have a physical or mental impairment that has a 'substantial' and 'long-term' negative effect on your ability to do normal daily activities. How is it different?
How is the policy on disability created here?
Are the student and staff policies similar or different, if yes in what way?
How active are disabled academics in the policy making structures of the university?
Development of the progression of equality objectives
Advocate on equality and diversity matters.
Work with staff and student equality networks.

Recruitment, Selection, Promotion and Dismissal
Fact: HESA statistics show that there are fewer disabled academics than we would expect. With that in mind, do you think there are any barriers in hiring and retaining disabled employees, particularly academic staff? Do you see a rise or fall in recruiting disabled teaching staff? Why do you think this is the case? Do you think (disability) legislation has an impact on recruitment, selection, promotion, dismissal policies of the university? Do you think the legislation is equal for staff and students? Did your University have to make any

changes/amendments or add or remove their policies and practises when the Equality Act came into force in 2010?
Do you think it is important to improve the number of disabled academics in Higher Education? Why?
Are there any policies and practices to encourage disabled academics to apply for vacancies here?
What considerations (objectives and features) are kept in mind during the selection process in relation to disabled candidates?
Do you require selection panel members to undergo equality and diversity training? If so, is disability covered?
How is the career progress of disabled academics monitored?
Are competency, retirement and redundancy procedures monitored in relation to the disabled employees (academics) that are affected? Do you think there are any particular issues of concern in relation to disabled academics?

Organizational Culture
Disability awareness in the University, Does the University provide any special training (other than selection panel members) on disability equality issues? What kind and aimed towards whom? Is information and services accessible to people who have a range of different disabilities?
University policies show a zero-tolerance approach to disability related harassment among staff, service users and the communities. Have you encountered any particular problems in relation to disability discrimination (like negative behaviour, abuse, violence)? By whom – other staff or students? What measure taken (just ignored and kept quiet, legal measures, disciplinary measures), what would you recommend?
How are reasonable adjustments for disabled employees decided upon?
Can you give me some examples of reasonable adjustments that have been put in place for disabled academics?
Do you think they worked/were useful/cost effective? Do you engage with staff who have a disability to make sure you have made reasonable adjustments in the workplace to support them in their role?
Any other relevant points you feel have not been covered or you'd like to add?
To make sure HEIs are following the Specific Duty, Equality Challenge Unit ECU has produced guidance on impact assessments which may be useful to help in considering demonstrating due regard called Equality impact

assessments (EIAs) (ensure fairness, compliance with legislation, and improve organisational effectiveness) and Engagement of disabled staff, etc.

Appendix Two

The OH prompt interview schedule sheet only for the author.

Topic 1: Academic with disabilities.

Topic 2: Workplace attitudes and behaviours.

Topic 3: Disability policies and management practises at their University.

Topic 4: Providing University support.

My prompt questions: About yourself - How you **became an academic**? Did you **always wanted** to **teach/become an academic in this subject** you are researching/teaching now? Do you feel that **your disability played a role** in it?

Importance of the nature and relationships with colleagues and within academic networks.

2: Accepting your disability - Do you feel that **behaviour and attitudes of other colleagues were acceptable towards you, the University policies, practises, and regulations, are you happy and comfortably working** at your University? Have they ever **been discriminated**? **Can things be made better**, in what way? Tell me **about your experiences** not to worry as everything shall be anonymised). Tell me what would you like to **improve**, any suggestions? Declaration of disability, tell me your experiences about it, did you have to negotiate with them (**reasonable adjustments**)?

3: **Career experiences**, negotiating the organization **- what would you like to research on**, anything: math, English, science, geography and why? Do you feel that **disabled researchers should be well-recognized**?

4: **University support provided?** Like reasonable adjustments. Your **involvement** in discussion making or equality policies and practices related activities. Your **feedback on University disability policies and practices.**

Appendix Three

Ethical Approval Certificate by Queen Mary Unver sty of London

Appendix Four

Information sheet Semi- structured interviews

Research study: Is the Ivory Tower wheelchair accessible?

I am a PhD student at Queen Mary University of London and I am researching working environments for disabled academics at universities in England. The Equality Act 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty have increased access and study conditions for disabled students within Higher Education. However, research has yet to fully address how far this positive impact may have been extended to disabled academics.

I am a disabled researcher and my research is inspired by my own experiences. My focus is on disabled academics career development within English universities, however I also need to find out about how the rules, regulations, policies and practices at universities have helped in eradicating barriers to accessibility (if any) for the Disabled academic staff members.

For this purpose, part of the qualitative methods of my research is to collect information through interviews from the human resource department at the University. The format of the interview shall be semi-structured and shall cover the following areas in relation to disability: equality and discrimination:

- Legislations being used in developing policies and practices at the University.
- Support being provided effectively at the University e.g. when teaching, giving research presentations and accessible workplace.
- Opportunities for advancement (achievements) like promotion, etc.
- Measures taken to monitor continuous equality and diversity auditing in order to maintain prevention of discrimination and provision of support services.

The timing, length and location of the interviews will be agreed with participants beforehand. It is anticipated that the interviews will take place within the workplace environment at the University. If

you do decide to take part in my research project, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form.

If you have any questions or concerns about the manner in which the study was conducted please, in the first instance, contact the researcher responsible for the study. If this is unsuccessful, or not appropriate, please contact the Secretary at the Queen Mary Ethics of Research Committee, Room W117, Queen's Building, Mile End Campus, Mile End Road, London or research-ethics@qmul.ac.uk.

Consent form for Semi- structured interviews

Please complete this form after you have read the Information Sheet and/or listened to an explanation about the research.

Title of Study: __ Is the Ivory Tower wheelchair accessible _____
Queen Mary Ethics of Research Committee Ref: _____

- Thank you for considering taking part in this research. The person organizing the research must explain the project to you before you agree to take part.

- If you have any questions arising from the Information Sheet or explanation already given to you, please ask the researcher before you decide whether to join in. You will be given a copy of this Consent Form to keep and refer to at any time.

- *I understand that if I decide at any other time during the research that I no longer wish to participate in this project, I can notify the researchers involved and be withdrawn from it immediately.*

- *I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.*

Participant's Statement:

I _____ _____ agree that the research project named above has been explained to me to my satisfaction and I agree to take part in the study. I have read both the notes written above and the Information Sheet about the project, and understand what the research study involves.

Signed: Date: 00/00/2014

Investigator's Statement:

I ____Nadia Ahmed_____ confirm that I have carefully explained the nature, demands and any foreseeable risks (where applicable) of the proposed research to the volunteer

Information sheet for OH interviews

Queen Mary
University of London

Research study: Is the Ivory Tower wheelchair accessible?

I am a PhD student at Queen Mary University of London and I am researching working environments for disabled academics at universities in England. The Equality Ac 2010 and the Public Sector Equality Duty have increased access and study conditions for disabled students within Higher Education. However, research has yet to fully address how far this positive impact may have been extended to disabled academics.

I am a disabled researcher and my research is inspired by my own experiences. My focus is on disabled academics' career development and includes lecturers and researchers. Part of the qualitative methods of my research is to collect oral histories from academics at 3 case study universities. The format of the oral history interviews will encourage disabled academics to reflect on their experiences and decisions during their own journey into academia, covering areas such as choice of discipline/field of research/teaching, employment opportunities, access issues, management, administration, work environment and relationships with colleagues. The timing, length and location of the interviews, including rest breaks will be agreed with participants beforehand. It is anticipated that the majority of interviews will take place within the university environment to contextualize the qualitative data collected during the interview process and to contribute to the auto-ethnographic element of my research. If you do decide to take part in my research project, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form.

If you have any questions or concerns about the manner in which the study was conducted please, in the first instance, contact the researcher responsible for the study. If this is unsuccessful, or not appropriate, please contact the Secretary at the Queen Mary Ethics of Research Committee, Room

W117, Queen's Building, Mile End Campus, Mile End Road, London or research-ethics@qmul.ac.uk.

Consent form for OH interviews

Queen Mary
University of London

Please complete this form after you have read the Information Sheet and/or listened to an explanation about the research.

Title of Study: __ Is the Ivory Tower wheelchair accessible _____
Queen Mary Ethics of Research Committee Ref: _____

- Thank you for considering taking part in this research. The person organizing the research must explain the project to you before you agree to take part.

- If you have any questions arising from the Information Sheet or explanation already given to you, please ask the researcher before you decide whether to join in. You will be given a copy of this Consent Form to keep and refer to at any time.

- *I understand that if I decide at any other time during the research that I no longer wish to participate in this project, I can notify the researchers involved and be withdrawn from it immediately.*

- *I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the provisions of the Data Protection Act 1998.*

Participant's Statement:

I _____ _____ agree that the research project named above has been explained to me to my satisfaction and I agree to take part in the study. I have read both the notes written above and the Information Sheet about the project, and understand what the research study involves.

Signed: Date: /2014

Investigator's Statement:

I ____Nadia Ahmed_____ confirm that I have carefully explained the nature, demands and any foreseeable risks (where applicable) of the proposed research to the volunteer